7/15/84 U3780-4.1-F A

Center for Human Resource Research

College of
Administrative Science

The Ohio State University

PATHWAYS TO THE FUTURE

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF YOUNG AMERICANS

Preliminary Report on the 1980 Survey

December 1981

PATHWAYS TO THE FUTURE

A LONGITUDINAL STUDY OF YOUNG AMERICANS

Preliminary Report on the 1980 Survey

Edited by Michael E. Borus

with chapters by

Michael E. Borus

Joan E. Crowley

Tom K. Pollard

and

Richard Santos

Center for Human Resource Research

The Ohio State University

December 1981

This paper was prepared under a contract with the Employment and Training Administration, U.S. Department of Labor, under the authority of the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Researchers undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express their own judgments. Interpretations or viewpoints contained in this document do not necessarily represent the official position or policy of the Department of Labor.

Table of Contents

Chapter Page

1 INTRODUCTION, BY MICHAEL E. BORUS.......1
Characteristics of the Youth Population.......1
Organization of This Report.......11

2 EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF YOUTH - 1980, BY RICHARD SANTOS.......12
Annual Change in the NLS and CPS Employment Status: 1979-1980....12
Employment Status Examined by Age, Race, and Sex.......16
Annual Change in Employment Status: 1979-1980.......18
Changes in Employment Status by School Enrollment.......20
Nonenrolled High School Graduates.......22
High School Dropouts.......22
High School Students.......27
College Students.......28
Changes in Survey Week Employment Conditions.......28
Survey Week Wage Changes.......31
Conclusions.......34
APPENDIX 2A - CPS-NLS Differences in Employment Status of Youth Age 16-21 - 1980.......37
Survey Differences by Race, Sex, and Age.......38
Survey Difference by Major Activity.......42
Conclusions.......45

3 RACE AND SEX DIFFERENCES IN THE EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS OF YOUTH, BY TOM K. POLLARD.......47
Race Differences Among Males.......50
Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Students.......51
Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Males No Longer in School - Dropouts.......51
Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Males No Longer in School - High School Graduates.......59
Summary of Differences by Race.......61
Differences by Sex in Employment Patterns.......62
Differences by Sex Among Students.......63
Sex Differences in Employment Patterns Among Out-of-School Youth.......64
Summary of Differences by Sex.......70

4 GOVERNMENT EMPLOYMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS: COMPARISONS OF CHARACTERISTICS, 1978-1979, BY JOAN E. CROWLEY.......73
Participant Characteristics.......74
Program Services.......78
Attitudes Toward Programs.......83
Summary.......88
GLOSSARY.......90
REFERENCES.......92

5 EDUCATION AND THE SCHOOLS YOUTH ATTEND, BY MICHAEL E. BORUS.......93
School Characteristics.......93
Receipt of Remedial Education.......102

Chapter Page

Enrollment Status in 1980....109
Schooling Decisions....112
Summary and Conclusions....121

6 CRIME AND DELINQUENCY: DESCRIPTIONS AND DISTRIBUTIONS, BY JOAN E. CROWLEY....123
Delinquent Behavior....124
Illegal Income....139
Reported Police Contacts....141
School Discipline....147
Consistency of Delinquency Measures....154
Summary....157
APPENDIX 1....160
APPENDIX 2....168
GLOSSARY....170
REFERENCES....172

Chapter 1
Introduction

by Michael E. Borus

In 1980 the second round of data was collected for the National Longitudinal Survey (NLS) Youth Cohort. These youth were 15-23 years of age when interviewed between January and May.[1] They represent a national crosssection of the 32,740,000 young persons born during 1957 through 1964 who were civilians at the time of their interview.

CHARACTERISTICS OF THE YOUTH POPULATION

Tables 1.1-1.4 present selected characteristics of this population. As one would expect, these characteristics are largely unchanged from the data gathered in 1979. As the sample aged a year, the proportion in high school declined from 49 percent to 37 percent while the proportions of high school dropouts and college students increased one and two percentage points, respectively, and the proportion of nonenrolled high school graduates increased eight percentage points. Similarly, the educational attainment of the population increased. The number who had participated in government sponsored employment and training programs also rose; approximately 960,000 persons who had not previously participated in these programs did so during 1979, bringing the total percentage of the 15-22 year old population who had ever participated in employment and training programs to 16 percent. About four percentage points more of the young persons were married in 1980. Finally, due to aging, more of the youth were employed than was true during the preceding year, and the proportion living in families below the poverty level fell from 15 to 14 percent.

---

[1] Almost all of the youth were interviewed 11 to 13 months after their 1979 interview and thus were approximately one year older than in the preceding year.

Table 1.1 Selected Characteristics, by Race (in Thousands)

Characteristic	Black		Hispanic		White		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Sex								
Female	2,298	51	1,042	50	13,076	50	16,416	50
Male	2,166	49	1,033	50	13,126	50	16,325	50
Age								
15	435	10	226	11	2,492	10	3,153	10
16-17	1,192	27	538	26	6,665	25	8,396	26
18-19	1,152	26	519	25	6,424	24	8,096	25
20-21	1,047	23	495	24	6,664	25	8,206	25
22-23	638	14	296	14	3,968	15	4,902	15
Region								
Northeast	804	18	397	19	5,532	21	6,732	21
North Central	864	19	172	8	8,833	34	9,870	30
South	2,531	57	583	28	7,640	29	10,754	33
West	266	6	922	44	4,204	16	5,386	16
Enrollment status								
High school dropout	746	17	516	25	2,785	11	4,047	12
High school student	1,855	42	802	39	9,529	36	12,186	37
College student	634	14	245	12	5,050	19	5,928	18
Nonenrolled high school student	1,229	28	512	25	8,844	34	10,585	32
Educational attainment								
0-8	380	8	324	16	1,328	5	2,032	6
9-11	2,222	50	994	48	10,979	42	14,195	43
12	1,201	27	469	23	8,552	33	10,222	31
13 or more	661	15	287	14	5,352	20	6,290	19
Not available	0	0	1	0	6	0	8	0
With a health limitation	246	6	109	6	1,493	6	1,848	6
Ever participated in government sponsored employment and training program	1,728	39	543	26	2,897	11	5,168	16
Marital and family status								
Never married	4,066	91	1,660	80	21,978	84	27,704	85
Married	292	6	334	16	3,758	14	4,384	13
Separated, widowed, divorced	106	2	81	4	466	2	652	2

Table 1.1 (continued)

Characteristic	Black		Hispanic		White		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Has children	758	17	321	16	2,234	9	3,312	10
Family income								
Less than $5,000	680	15	218	10	1,577	6	2,474	8
5,000-9,999	870	20	371	18	2,594	10	3,836	12
10,000-14,999	630	14	324	16	2,770	11	3,723	11
15,000-19,999	383	9	223	11	2,845	11	3,451	10
20,000-24,999	311	7	190	9	2,738	10	3,238	10
25,000-29,999	198	4	113	6	2,193	8	2,504	8
30,000-39,999	178	4	127	6	3,078	12	3,382	10
40,000 or more	157	4	78	4	3,317	13	3,552	11
Not available	1,059	24	431	21	5,103	20	6,593	20
Income below poverty								
Not below poverty	2,489	56	1,331	64	22,010	84	25,830	79
Below poverty	1,571	35	549	26	2,270	9	4,389	13
Not available	404	9	195	9	1,923	7	2,522	8
Employment status[a]								
Employed	1,781	44	977	53	14,986	63	17,749	60
Unemployed	852	21	283	15	2,638	11	3,771	13
Out of labor force	1,396	35	589	32	6,097	26	8,080	27
Total	4,464	14	2,075	6	26,202	80	32,741	100

[a] Only for persons 16-23 on the date of interview.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

Table 1.2 Selected Characteristics, by Sex (in Thousands)

Characteristic	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Age						
15	1,532	9	1,621	10	3,153	10
16-17	4,151	25	4,245	26	8,396	26
18-19	4,065	25	4,031	25	8,096	25
20-21	4,176	25	4,030	25	8,206	25
22-23	2,498	15	2,404	15	4,902	15
Region						
Northeast	3,339	20	3,394	21	6,733	21
North Central	4,754	29	5,120	31	9,875	30
South	5,643	34	5,115	31	10,758	33
West	2,685	16	2,701	16	5,387	16
Enrollment status						
High school dropout	1,921	12	2,126	13	4,047	12
High school student	5,818	35	6,371	39	12,189	37
College student	3,008	18	2,922	18	5,928	18
Nonenrolled high school graduate	5,676	35	4,912	30	10,587	32
Educational attainment						
1-8	839	5	1,193	7	2,032	6
9-11	6,894	42	7,303	45	14,198	43
12	5,317	32	4,907	30	10,224	31
13 or more	3,366	20	2,925	18	6,290	19
Not available	6	0	1	0	8	0
With a health limitation	1,171	7	677	4	1,848	6
Ever participated in government sponsored employment and training program	2,558	16	2,609	16	5,168	16
Marital and family status						
Never married	12,918	79	14,778	90	27,697	84
Married	3,012	18	137	8	4,384	13
Separated, widowed, divorced	482	3	171	1	652	2
Has children	2,591	16	722	4	3,312	10

Table 1.2 (continued)

Characteristic	Female		Male		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Family income						
Less than $5,000	1,449	9	1,025	6	2,474	8
5,000-9,999	2,129	13	1,707	10	3,836	12
10,000-14,999	1,870	11	1,853	11	3,723	11
15,000-19,999	1,884	12	1,566	10	3,450	10
20,000-24,999	1,577	10	1,661	10	3,238	10
25,000-29,999	1,154	10	1,351	8	2,504	8
30,000-39,999	1,632	10	1,751	11	3,382	10
40,000 or more	1,581	10	1,970	12	3,551	11
Not available	3,146	19	3,446	21	6,593	20
Income below poverty						
Not below poverty	12,753	78	13,074	80	25,827	79
Below poverty	2,396	15	1,994	12	4,389	13
Not available	1,266	8	1,256	8	2,522	8
Employment status[a]						
Employed	8,374	56	9,377	64	17,749	60
Unemployed	1,774	12	1,998	14	3,771	13
Out of labor force	4,742	32	3,336	23	8,080	27
Total	16,416	50	16,325	50	32,741	100

[a] Only for persons 16-23 on the date of interview.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

Table 1.3 Selected Characteristics, by Age (in Thousands)

Characteristic	15		16-17		18-19		20-21		22-23		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Region												
Northeast	620	20	1,708	20	1,689	21	1,745	21	971	20	6,732	21
North Central	1,035	33	2,482	30	2,489	31	2,490	30	1,378	28	9,870	30
South	967	31	2,875	34	2,632	32	2,601	32	1,684	34	8,096	33
West	531	17	1,331	16	1,286	16	1,370	17	868	18	4,902	16
Enrollment status												
High school dropout	53	2	825	10	1,286	16	1,182	14	702	14	4,047	12
High school student	3,101	98	7,422	88	1,618	20	44	0	0	0	12,186	30
College student	0	0	43	0	2,408	30	2,433	30	1,045	21	10,754	33
Nonenrolled high school graduate	0	0	104	1	2,783	34	4,548	55	3,155	64	5,386	16
Educational attainment												
0-8	841	27	584	7	215	3	228	3	164	3	2,032	6
9-11	2,312	73	7,662	91	2,690	33	996	12	537	11	14,195	43
12	0	0	147	2	4,158	51	3,789	46	2,130	44	10,222	31
13 or more	0	0	0	0	1,033	13	3,187	39	2,071	42	6,290	19
With a health limitation	156	5	408	5	460	6	509	6	316	6	1,848	6
Ever participated in government sponsored employment and training program	253	8	1,013	12	1,407	17	1,536	19	958	20	5,168	16
Marital and family status												
Never married	3,149	100	8,228	98	7,276	90	6,036	74	3,020	62	27,704	85
Married	4	0	156	2	733	9	1,895	23	1,599	33	4,384	13
Separated, widowed, divorced	0	0	8	0	86	1	276	3	283	6	652	2
Has children	15	0	174	2	565	7	1,368	17	1,191	24	3,312	10

Table 1.3 (continued)

Characteristic	15		16-17		18-19		20-21		22-23		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Family income												
Less than $5,000	164	5	407	5	684	8	726	9	493	10	2,474	8
5,000-9,999	294	9	752	9	799	10	1,249	15	742	15	3,836	12
10,000-14,999	307	10	929	11	821	10	992	12	674	14	3,723	11
15,000-19,999	360	11	1,002	12	694	9	860	10	534	11	3,451	10
20,000-24,999	410	13	1,022	12	738	9	673	8	396	8	3,238	10
25,000-29,999	241	8	794	10	599	7	531	6	340	7	2,504	8
30,000-39,999	466	15	1,043	12	947	12	634	8	292	6	3,382	10
40,000 or more	298	10	890	11	996	12	943	12	424	9	3,552	11
Not available	615	20	1,558	19	1,817	22	1,597	26	1,006	20	6,593	20
Income below poverty												
Not below poverty	2,564	81	6,842	82	6,274	78	6,499	79	3,662	75	25,830	79
Below poverty	449	14	1,193	14	1,182	15	968	12	598	12	4,389	13
Not available	141	4	360	4	640	8	740	9	642	13	2,522	8
Employment status[a]												
Employed			3,715	44	4,945	61	5,557	68	3,543	72	17,749	60
Unemployed			1,506	18	983	12	826	10	452	9	3,771	13
Out of labor force			3,175	38	2,168	27	1,823	22	907	18	8,080	27
Total	3,152	10	8,392	26	8,093	25	8,203	25	4,900	15	32,741	100

[a] Only for persons 16-23 on the date of interview.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

Table 1.4 Selected Characteristics, by Poverty Status[a] (in Thousands)

Characteristic	Not in		Poverty		Not available		Total	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Region								
Northeast	5,391	21	884	20	407	18	6,733	20
North Central	8,148	32	973	22	751	30	9,873	30
South	8,015	31	1,926	44	814	32	10,755	33
West	4,282	17	604	14	500	20	5,387	16
Enrollment status								
High school dropout	2,360	9	1,136	9	551	22	4,047	12
High school student	10,097	39	1,600	39	488	19	12,185	37
College student	4,956	19	622	19	350	14	5,955	18
Nonenrolled high school graduate	8,420	33	1,030	33	1,134	45	10,585	32
Educational attainment								
0-8	1,166	4	669	15	196	8	2,032	6
9-11	11,284	44	2,067	47	843	33	14,194	43
12	8,278	32	974	22	969	38	10,221	31
13 or more	5,097	20	679	16	514	20	6,290	19
Not available	8	0	0	0	0	0	8	0
With a health limitation	1,311	5	349	8	188	10	1,848	6
Ever participated in government sponsored employment and training program	3,366	13	1,316	30	486	19	5,168	16
Marital and family status								
Never married	22,152	86	3,890	88	1,660	66	27,701	84
Married	3,305	13	299	7	780	31	4,384	13
Separated, widowed, divorced	369	1	201	5	83	3	652	2
Has children	2,100	8	703	16	510	20	3,312	10
Employment status[b]								
Employed	14,673	63	1,608	41	1,467	62	17,749	60
Unemployed	2,630	11	806	20	335	14	3,771	13
Out of labor force	5,973	26	1,527	39	580	24	8,080	27
Total	25,830	79	4,389	13	2,522	8	32,741	100

[a] Poverty status is defined using family income and size as set forth in Current Population Report P-60, No. 125.

When family income was unavailable the respondents were asked whether their family income was above or below the Office of Management and Budget guidelines for families of their size, living on a farm (if appropriate) and having special cutoffs for Alaska and Hawaii.

[b] Only for persons 16-23 on the date of interview.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

The differences by race and sex observed in 1979 continued in 1980. Blacks tended to be concentrated in the South and Hispanics in the West. The proportion of high school dropouts was more than twice as high for Hispanics as for whites and 50 percent higher for blacks than for whites. The percentage of blacks who had participated in government employment and training programs (nearly 40 percent) was three and one half times higher than that for whites; among Hispanics, the participation rate was double that of whites. A higher proportion of blacks had never married than whites or Hispanics, but the percentage of blacks with children, at 17 percent, was almost double that of whites.

The percentage of blacks age 16-21 who were employed (41 percent) was about two-thirds of that of whites (61 percent) and the proportion of Hispanics who were employed (50 percent) was approximately 20 percent less than that of whites.[2] The labor force participation rates of blacks and Hispanics were also below those of whites, although at 63, 66, and 73 percent, respectively, the differences were not large. The major differences by race in the unemployment rates continued. The unemployment rates of black youth were twice those of whites and one and one half those of Hispanics. At 35, 25, and 16 percent the rates showed virtually no change over the preceding year when they were 38, 23 and 16 percent, respectively, for blacks, Hispanics and whites. Finally, the proportion in poverty was much higher for black and Hispanic youth. Thirty-eight percent of the black youth had 1979 family incomes which placed them below the poverty line as compared to 29 percent of the Hispanic and 10 percent of the white youth.

---

[2] Among youth 16-23 the differentials were not quite as large; the black/white ratio was .7 and the Hispanic/white ratio was .84.

More of the young women were married and more had had children than was true of the young men. Fewer of the young women than young men were employed, and the unemployment rates of the young men and women were very similar. A somewhat greater proportion of the young women were in families whose 1979 income was below the poverty line--16 percent as opposed to 13 percent for the young men.[3] In other areas, however, the young men and young women were very similar.

The distribution of characteristics by age in Table 1.3 shows some interesting trends. The proportion who live in the North Central states declines from 33 percent of 15-year olds to 28 percent of 22 and 23 year olds, while there is an increase from 31 percent to 34 percent in the proportion living in the South. Young adults are obviously highly mobile and these distributional changes reflect the movement of the population. Table 1.3 also shows that approximately 14 percent of 22-23 year olds are high school drop-outs and 42 percent have completed at least one year of college. Overall, approximately 20 percent of the population have participated in a government sponsored employment and training program by the time they reach age 22-23. At this same age, nearly two-thirds have never married, although of those who have married, 15 percent have been separated or divorced.

Youth whose family income in 1979 was below the poverty line tended to have lower educational attainment, to be more prone to health problems which prevented or limited the amount of work they could do, to be separated, widowed or divorced, to be unemployed or out of the labor force, and to have had children. As would be expected, nearly one-third of those who are in poverty had participated in government training programs, more than twice the proportion of those not living in poverty.

---

[3] These figures assume that persons for whom family income data were not available were distributed proportionately to those persons who provided the information.

ORGANIZATION OF THIS REPORT

This preliminary report contains five additional chapters. Because of the short time that the data have been available for analysis, these chapters are descriptive in nature and the analysis is simple crosstabular presentation. The five chapters, which follow, treat the following subjects. Chapter 2 discusses the employment and unemployment status of the youth population at the time of the interview. Information is presented on the labor force participation and unemployment rates of various segments of the population, the job search activities of the unemployed and the nature of the employment of those who are working. Chapter 3 examines the employment history of the young people during the preceding year including the number of weeks worked and job turnover. Participation in government employment and training programs is the subject of Chapter 4. Here the report presents the characteristics of participants in these programs, the types of services they receive, and their reaction to the programs. Chapter 5 considers the education and schooling of the youth; particular attention is paid to the decisions to drop out of high school, to return to high school, to graduate from high school (for 12th graders), and to go on to college. Finally, Chapter 6 analyzes delinquent behavior by this age group and their contacts with law enforcement agencies. The analysis describes those who engage in various types of delinquent behavior and the frequency of such behavior.

Chapter 2

Employment Status of Youth - 1980*

by Richard Santos

During the first part of 1980, the nation entered a recession. Unemployment increased from the previous year; the national annual unemployment rate was 7.1 in 1980 as compared to 5.8 in 1979.[1] For teenagers age 16-19, unemployment climbed from 16.1 in 1979 to 17.7 in 1980. The goods-producing industries--specifically housing, automobiles, and related supplier industries--were especially vulnerable to the recession. On the other hand, service industries and, to a lesser degree, retail trade, both of which are likely to employ youth, enjoyed employment gains in 1980. This chapter examines the labor force participation, unemployment rates, and employment/population ratios of youth age 16-21 during the first five months of 1980 and notes the changes in employment status from the previous year. Employment conditions in both survey years are also compared.

ANNUAL CHANGE IN THE NLS AND CPS EMPLOYMENT STATUS: 1979-1980

Employment status of youth age 16-21, as measured by the Current Population Survey (CPS), is noted in Table 2.1 for the first five months in 1980 and shows the worsening of the youth labor market as compared to 1979. Labor force participation declined from the previous year in every month except May. Unemployment increased slightly in the first four months and soared in the month of May. The employment/population ratio also declined

---

*Hojin Kang provided the research assistance for this chapter.

[1] The employment conditions in 1980 are drawn from "Employment and Unemployment: A Report on 1980," Monthly Labor Review (U.S. Department of Labor: Washington, D.C., February 1981).

Table 2.1 CPS Employment Status of Youth Age 16-21 by Selected Month, 1979-1980

	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change
Jan.	60.1	59.5	-.6	15.0	15.7	+.7	51.1	50.2	-.9
Feb.	59.3	58.4	-.9	15.0	15.6	+.6	50.4	49.3	-1.1
March	59.9	58.9	-1.0	14.1	14.9	+.8	51.5	50.1	-1.4
April	59.8	58.4	-1.5	13.0	14.0	+1.0	52.2	50.2	-2.0
May	60.4	61.0	+.6	13.0	16.5	+3.5	52.5	50.9	-1.6

Source: U.S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings.

from 1979, especially in April and May. In March 1980, the civilian youth labor force was 14.4 million, a decline of .3 million from March 1979. The number of unemployed youth remained about the same (2.1 million) in March 1979 and 1980, but those employed declined from 12.6 million to 12.2 million.

The NLS 1980 estimates of labor force participation (LFPR), unemployment. and employment/population ratio continued to be substantially higher than CPS.[2] The change in the employment status of NLS youth from 1979-80, as noted in Table 2.2, did not indicate the deterioration of employment conditions shown by the CPS.[3] The NLS employment status estimates were higher, in fact, than the CPS but remained basically unchanged from the previous year. In 1980, the NLS estimate of labor force size differed from the NLS 1979 only by an additional 100,000 employed youth, and the number of unemployed youth remained virtually unchanged. In both 1979 and 1980, the NLS measure of the youth LFPR was 71 percent, unemployment measured about 19 percent, and the employment/population ratio was 57 percent. Overall, the NLS showed that the size of the youth labor force increased by 100,000 in 1980 to 17.5 million, and all of these young people were employed.

Changes in the employment status of NLS youth from the previous year did appear by race and sex. Labor force participation remained virtually unchanged, however, for both white males and females, increased for Hispanic

---

[2] For discussion of CPS-NLS differences in employment status of youth, see R. Santos, "Measuring the Employment Status of Youth: CPS-NLS Differences." Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting, Madison: Industrial Relations Research Association, 1981, pp. 62-68. As noted in other studies, the NLS estimates of the youth employment have generally been higher than those obtained by the CPS.

[3] Only youth between the age of 16-21 are included in this analysis; as in the CPS, younger youth are not considered. Those interviewed after May (less than 1 percent) are excluded to control for the large influx of students to the labor force during the summer. These youth are assumed to be distributed proportionately to those who were interviewed prior to the summer.

Table 2.2 NLS Employment Status by Sex and Race, 1979 and 1980 Survey

Sex	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change
				Black					
Female	60.1	57.7	-2.4	41.2	38.1	-3.1	35.4	35.7	+.3
Male	71.0	68.5	-2.5	36.0	32.0	-4.0	45.4	46.5	+1.1
Total	65.3	62.9	-2.4	38.5	34.9	-3.6	40.2	41.0	+.8
				Hispanic					
Female	53.4	56.9	+3.5	24.7	21.5	-3.2	40.2	44.7	+4.5
Male	70.7	75.8	+5.1	22.0	27.0	+5.0	55.1	55.3	+.2
Total	61.8	66.5	+5.3	23.2	24.7	+1.5	47.5	50.1	+2.6
				White					
Female	70.0	69.4	-.6	17.5	16.0	-1.5	57.7	58.3	+.6
Male	74.9	76.0	+1.1	14.4	16.3	+1.9	64.1	63.6	-.5
Total	72.4	72.7	+.3	15.9	16.2	+.3	60.9	60.9	0
				Total					
Female	67.6	67.0	-.6	20.7	18.9	-1.8	53.6	54.3	+.7
Male	74.1	75.0	+.9	17.6	18.9	+1.3	61.1	60.8	-.3
Total	70.8	71.0	+.2	19.1	18.9	-.2	57.3	57.5	+.2

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=24,580,000) in 1979 and (N=24,700,000) in 1980.

males and females, and declined for black youth. Unemployment declined for all groups of females and for black males. Among Hispanic males, unemployment increased from 22 percent in 1979 to 27 percent in 1980. White males also experienced an increase in unemployment from 14 percent to 16 percent. The employment/population ratios in 1980 showed no change from 1979 except among Hispanic females where the increase was from 40 to 45 percent.

The surprising improvement in the NLS black youth unemployment rate can partially be accounted for by their LFPR decline from the previous year. In fact, the unemployment decline does not necessarily represent an improvement. Black youth were the only group to have participated less in the labor force from 1979, and if they were dropping out of the labor force due to poor employment prospects in 1980, these discouraged youth could account for the unemployment decline. On the other hand, both white and Hispanic males remained in the labor force during the economic recession and, thus, their unemployment increased.

EMPLOYMENT STATUS EXAMINED BY AGE, RACE, AND SEX

In 1980 the employment difficulties of youth, as noted in Table 2.3, continued to be compounded for younger youth, blacks, Hispanics, and females. Unemployment was more acute for youth age 16-17, and among blacks in this age range the unemployment rate approached 50 percent. For black males age 16-17, the unemployment rate dropped from the previous year, but so did labor force participation. The LFPR dropped 7 percentage points from the previous year for black males, and it declined by 5 points for black females age 16-17.

In contrast, the LFPR for white males age 16-17 increased by 4 percentage points and remained basically unchanged for older males and all females. By

Table 2.3 Employment Status, by Sex, Race and Age, 1979 and 1980 Survey

Sex and age	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change	1979	1980	Change
				Black					
Female									
16-17	48.1	43.6	-4.5	54.6	52.9	-1.7	21.9	20.5	-1.4
18-19	63.9	64.9	+1.0	40.3	36.1	-4.2	38.1	41.5	+3.4
20-21	67.9	65.1	-2.8	32.6	30.0	-2.6	45.8	45.6	-.2
Male									
16-17	59.6	52.8	-6.8	53.5	47.1	-6.4	27.7	27.9	+.2
18-19	72.8	72.5	-.3	33.7	29.2	-4.5	48.3	51.3	+3.0
20-21	82.9	83.8	+.9	22.8	22.9	+.1	64.0	64.7	+.7
				Hispanic					
Female									
16-17	42.0	47.6	+5.6	36.7	32.8	-3.9	26.5	32.0	+5.5
18-19	57.3	58.3	+1.0	22.3	20.2	-2.1	44.5	46.5	+2.0
20-21	60.3	65.2	+4.9	19.1	13.9	-5.2	48.8	56.1	+7.3
Male									
16-17	60.1	65.2	+5.1	37.9	43.3	+5.4	37.3	37.0	-.3
18-19	76.2	78.1	+1.9	16.0	21.6	+5.6	64.0	61.2	-2.8
20-21	77.7	85.5	+7.8	13.3	17.9	+4.6	67.3	70.2	-2.9
				White					
Female									
16-17	62.4	61.5	-.9	25.0	24.9	-.1	46.8	46.2	-.6
18-19	73.9	71.9	-2.0	17.4	12.6	-4.8	61.1	62.8	+1.8
20-21	73.5	74.7	+1.2	11.2	11.8	+.6	65.3	65.9	+.6
Male									
16-17	64.4	68.6	+4.2	23.3	25.8	+2.5	49.4	50.9	+1.5
18-19	77.7	77.0	-.7	12.8	14.7	+1.9	67.9	65.7	+2.2
20-21	82.9	82.6	-.3	8.6	9.8	+1.2	75.8	74.5	-1.3
				Total					
Female									
16-17	59.2	58.1	-.9	28.8	28.3	-.5	42.2	41.7	-.5
18-19	71.5	70.1	-1.4	20.5	16.1	-4.4	56.8	58.8	+2.0
20-21	71.9	72.9	+1.0	14.4	14.2	-.2	61.5	62.5	+1.0
Male									
16-17	63.5	66.2	+2.7	28.1	29.3	+1.2	45.6	46.7	-1.1
18-19	77.0	76.4	-.6	15.6	17.1	+1.5	64.9	63.4	-1.5
20-21	82.6	82.9	+.3	10.6	11.8	+1.2	73.9	73.1	-.8

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=24,580,000) in 1979 and (N=24,700,000) in 1980.

and large, white males experienced an increase in unemployment from the previous year while the female unemployment rate (with the exception of age 18-19) remained largely unchanged. Among Hispanic males and females, LFPR increased from the previous year. Hispanic females, especially those age 16-17 and age 20-21, however, appeared to have been more successful at locating employment than males, as evidenced by their increased employment/population ratios and lower unemployment rates from the preceding year. By comparison, Hispanic males at all ages experienced more unemployment and lower employment/population ratios in the second survey year.

ANNUAL CHANGE IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS: 1979-1980

Table 2.4 presents the spring 1979 employment status of youth age 16-21 and compares it with spring 1980 employment status. In general, about 3 out of every 4 employed youth in 1979 also had a job in 1980. For youth who were either unemployed or out of the labor force (OLF) in 1979, the 1980 employment status is not as predictable. Moreover, the change in employment status was not uniform by sex or race. Among unemployed youth, half of the males and nearly that proportion of the females were employed in the second NLS survey. A quarter of the unemployed males and a fifth of the females remained unemployed in 1980. Unemployed females were more likely to have become OLF; schooling and keeping house were cited by 26 percent of the unemployed females in 1979 as their major survey week activity. Among males who were unemployed in 1979, about a fifth were outside the labor force in 1980.

By race and sex, whites and Hispanic males employed in 1979 were more likely than black males to have been employed during the second survey interview. Among unemployed males, over half of the whites had a job in the second survey compared to slightly over two-fifths of the Hispanics or

Table 2.4 Annual Change in Employment Status of Youth Age 16-21 in 1979 to 1980

Employment status, 1979 survey	Employment status and major activity, 1980 survey					
	Employed	Unemployed	Keeping house	School	All other	Military
Total						
Employed	78	8	2	8	2	1
Unemployed	49	24	6	14	5	1
OLF	37	13	11	33	5	1
Male						
Employed	80	9	0	7	3	2
Unemployed	52	27	0	14	5	3
OLF	38	14	1	40	5	2
Female						
Employed	77	8	5	9	2	0
Unemployed	46	22	12	14	5	0
OLF	36	12	20	28	5	0
Black male						
Employed	68	14	0	8	5	4
Unemployed	45	25	0	19	6	5
OLF	32	23	1	35	6	4
Black female						
Employed	69	13	7	8	3	0
Unemployed	32	31	11	18	7	1
OLF	25	19	17	30	8	1
Hispanic male						
Employed	79	13	0	5	3	0
Unemployed	46	28	0	14	11	2
OLF	36	18	0	39	6	1
Hispanic female						
Employed	75	8	7	6	3	1
Unemployed	46	15	17	13	10	0
OLF	28	12	31	23	6	0
White male						
Employed	81	8	0	6	3	2
Unemployed	55	27	0	12	4	2
OLF	39	12	1	42	5	2
White female						
Employed	78	7	4	9	2	0
Unemployed	51	20	12	13	4	0
OLF	39	10	19	28	4	0

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date in 1979 (N=24,580,000).

blacks. Unemployed black males were also more likely to be out of the labor force in the second survey than either whites or Hispanics; one-third of the unemployed in 1980 were OLF as compared to about one-fifth for whites and Hispanics. Less than 2 percent of the unemployed Hispanics or whites in 1979 were in the military in 1980, as compared to 5 percent of the blacks.

Half of the OLF white and Hispanic males in 1979, but only two-fifths of the OLF blacks, participated in the labor force in the second survey year. Less than one-fifth of the OLF blacks were employed in comparison to over a third of the whites and Hispanics. Schooling was the major survey week activity in 1980 for the OLF males, irrespective of race.

Among females, most of those employed in 1979 continued to have jobs, but blacks were more likely not to be employed in the second survey year than whites or Hispanics. For females unemployed in 1979, blacks accounted for the highest proportion who were also unemployed in 1980. The second survey year also showed that about 40 percent of unemployed females in the preceding year were no longer in the labor force, irrespective of race. Half of the 1979 OLF white females participated in the labor force during the 1980 survey week--more than the proportion of OLF minority females. Among both unemployed and OLF females in 1979, those who remained outside the labor force in 1980 cited schooling and keeping house as their predominant major survey week activities. More frequently than either blacks or whites, Hispanics cited keeping house more often than school as their major survey week activity.

CHANGES IN EMPLOYMENT STATUS BY SCHOOL ENROLLMENT

Changes in employment status of youth from the previous survey are closely associated with changes in school enrollment status. Table 2.5 shows the change in enrollment status between 1979 and 1980 among youth age 16-21 in

Table 2.5 Annual Change in School Enrollment Status of Youth Age 16-21 in 1979

1979 school enrollment status	Changes in school enrollment status, 1980			
	High school dropouts	High school students	College students	Nonenrolled high school graduates
High school dropouts	89	2	1	8
High school students	7	57	16	20
College students	0	0	74	26
Nonenrolled high school graduates	0	0	8	92

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date in 1979 (N=24,580,000).

1979. The vast majority of high school dropouts, unenrolled high school graduates, and, to a lesser degree, college students did not change school enrollment status. Most of the change occurred, as one would expect, among high school students. While nearly six out of ten were still in high school in 1980, one-fifth were nonenrolled high school graduates, one-sixth were in college, and about 7 percent had dropped out. With the exception of high school students, the school enrollment status of youth in 1980 appeared to have remained basically the same, but within school enrollment categories, there were considerable changes in employment status between survey years (Tables 2.6-2.9).

Nonenrolled High School Graduates

Most of the employed high school graduates in 1979 continued to hold jobs in 1980, but the proportion was less for minority youth and females. Of the unemployed nonenrolled high school graduates in the 1979 survey, most also held jobs in the second survey; nearly 60 percent were employed in 1980. Almost three-fourths of the unemployed Hispanic graduates, both males and females, were employed in the second survey year. Among unemployed males in 1979, 7 percent of the blacks were in the military in 1980, but the proportion was less than 2 percent for whites and Hispanics. However, 8 percent of the white males who had been OLF in 1979 were in the military in 1980, in comparison to 3 percent of blacks. Among black OLF female graduates, 5 percent were in the military in 1980, but the proportion was not significant for white or Hispanic females.

High School Dropouts

Among male dropouts, youth employed in 1979 were more than likely to hold

Table 2.6 Annual Change in Employment Status of Nonenrolled High School Graduates in 1979

Employment status, 1979 survey	Employment status, 1980 survey					
	Employed	UE	Keeping house	School	All other	Military
Total						
Employed	84	8	4	2	2	1
Unemployed	59	21	10	4	5	1
OLF	40	14	34	5	5	2
Male						
Employed	87	7	0	3	2	1
Unemployed	69	28	0	0	1	2
OLF	46	27	0	12	9	6
Female						
Employed	81	9	7	2	2	0
Unemployed	54	18	15	6	7	1
OLF	38	11	43	3	5	1
Black male						
Employed	75	16	0	2	4	3
Unemployed	68	23	0	0	3	7
OLF	31	39	0	9	19	3
Black female						
Employed	71	14	9	2	4	1
Unemployed	41	24	17	10	5	3
OLF	30	19	32	7	7	5
Hispanic male						
Employed	86	8	0	0	4	2
Unemployed	75	20	0	6	0	0
OLF	33	15	0	40	12	0
Hispanic female						
Employed	81	5	6	3	4	2
Unemployed	74	0	16	0	10	0
OLF	40	13	31	2	14	0
White male						
Employed	88	6	0	3	2	0
Unemployed	69	30	0	0	1	0
OLF	52	25	0	10	6	8
White female						
Employed	82	8	7	1	2	0
Unemployed	58	16	14	5	7	0
OLF	39	10	45	2	4	0

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date in 1979 (N=6,700,000).

Table 2.7 Annual Change in Employment Status of High School Dropouts in 1979

Employment status, 1979 survey	Employment status, 1980 survey					
	Employed	UE	Keeping house	School	All other	Military
Total						
Employed	74	14	5	1	5	2
Unemployed	43	28	15	3	11	1
OLF	24	20	42	4	11	1
Male						
Employed	74	15	1	1	6	4
Unemployed	52	30	0	3	14	1
OLF	35	34	0	6	22	3
Female						
Employed	72	13	13	1	2	0
Unemployed	34	26	30	2	7	0
OLF	20	15	54	3	7	0
Black male						
Employed	65	19	0	1	11	4
Unemployed	49	25	0	10	15	1
OLF	40	35	0	3	15	7
Black female						
Employed	55	18	23	4	0	0
Unemployed	21	35	26	6	12	0
OLF	9	25	40	8	18	0
Hispanic male						
Employed	82	14	1	1	3	0
Unemployed	54	24	0	2	14	6
OLF	37	31	0	13	15	5
Hispanic female						
Employed	74	11	12	0	3	0
Unemployed	34	22	28	0	17	0
OLF	14	10	69	2	5	0
White male						
Employed	75	14	1	1	5	4
Unemployed	53	33	0	1	13	0
OLF	33	35	0	6	27	0
White female						
Employed	73	13	12	0	2	0
Unemployed	39	23	32	1	4	0
OLF	26	13	55	2	4	0

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=3,070,000).

Table 2.8 Annual Change in Employment Status of High School Students in 1979

Employment status, 1979 survey	Employment status, 1980 survey					
	Employed	UE	Keeping house	School	All other	Military
Total						
Employed	73	9	1	13	2	2
Unemployed	45	24	2	23	3	3
OLF	38	14	3	39	4	1
Male						
Employed	75	10	0	10	2	4
Unemployed	46	27	0	22	2	4
OLF	37	15	1	41	4	2
Female						
Employed	71	8	1	17	2	0
Unemployed	45	22	4	25	3	1
OLF	39	14	6	37	4	0
Black male						
Employed	61	11	1	18	2	7
Unemployed	33	27	0	29	5	7
OLF	30	21	1	41	4	2
Black female						
Employed	62	14	5	16	3	1
Unemployed	30	33	3	28	5	2
OLF	26	19	6	44	6	1
Hispanic male						
Employed	70	15	0	12	3	0
Unemployed	36	31	0	20	13	0
OLF	31	21	0	43	4	2
Hispanic female						
Employed	59	16	8	14	3	0
Unemployed	45	8	11	32	5	0
OLF	31	15	7	42	5	0
White male						
Employed	76	9	0	9	2	3
Unemployed	52	26	0	19	0	3
OLF	40	13	1	41	4	2
White female						
Employed	73	7	1	18	2	0
Unemployed	50	19	4	24	2	1
OLF	44	12	5	35	4	0

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=8,600,000).

Table 2.9 Annual Change in Employment Status of College Students in 1979

Employment status, 1979 survey	Employment status, 1980 survey					
	Employed	UE	Keeping house	School	All other	Military
Total						
Employed	78	4	0	14	3	0
Unemployed	57	19	0	18	6	0
OLF	40	5	1	49	4	1
Male						
Employed	79	5	0	14	3	0
Unemployed	54	16	1	22	8	0
OLF	38	6	0	51	3	2
Female						
Employed	77	4	1	15	3	0
Unemployed	59	22	0	14	6	0
OLF	41	5	2	46	5	0
Black male						
Employed	74	7	0	16	1	3
Unemployed	65	13	3	19	0	0
OLF	33	16	0	45	1	5
Black female						
Employed	78	7	0	11	4	0
Unemployed	40	31	0	23	6	0
OLF	40	14	6	35	5	0
Hispanic male						
Employed	81	9	0	11	0	0
Unemployed	29	39	0	32	0	0
OLF	48	0	0	43	9	0
Hispanic female						
Employed	83	5	2	9	2	0
Unemployed	68	25	0	8	0	0
OLF	49	8	3	37	4	0
White male						
Employed	79	5	0	14	3	0
Unemployed	53	15	0	22	10	0
OLF	38	5	0	52	3	1
White female						
Employed	77	3	1	16	3	0
Unemployed	64	19	0	11	6	0
OLF	41	4	2	49	6	0

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=4,500,000).

jobs in the second survey year; the lowest proportion of those employed was comprised of blacks, the highest of Hispanics. Half of the unemployed males in 1979 were employed in 1980, but blacks slightly trailed whites and Hispanics. About 8 out of every 10 OLF male high school dropouts in 1979 were in the labor force in 1980. Few of the males listed the military as their employment status in 1980; black and Hispanic dropouts were, however, more likely to be in the military than whites.

Female dropouts, especially blacks, were less likely to hold jobs in 1980 than males, regardless of employment status in 1979. Keeping house emerged as a major survey week activity in 1980 for female dropouts who were in the labor force during 1979. In addition, 6 percent of all the male or female dropouts cited schooling as the major survey week activity.

High School Students

Three out of every four employed white male high school students in 1979 were also employed in the second survey year; the proportion was, however, less for blacks and Hispanics. The proportion of employed white females was nearly the same as the proportion of employed white males in 1980, but minority females trailed white females.

Among unemployed high school students in 1979, whites were more likely to have a job in 1980 than blacks or Hispanics. One-fifth of the unemployed in 1979 currently stated schooling was their major survey week activity, though black males and females and Hispanic females cited schooling as the major survey week activity more frequently than the overall proportion of the unemployed. As one would expect, schooling continued to be the major activity for OLF youth in 1980. Seven percent of 1979 employed and unemployed black male high school students cited the military in 1980; among other 1979 high school students, the proportion was much smaller.

College Students

Most of the employed college youth in 1979 continued to hold jobs in 1980 or currently listed school as their major survey week activity. Among the unemployed college students in 1979, the highest proportion of employment in 1980 was among blacks; the lowest proportion was among Hispanic males. Nearly two-fifths of the OLF college students had located employment in 1980. With the exception of minority youth, most college students who had been employed in 1979 either found a job or listed school as their major activity in 1980.

CHANGES IN SURVEY WEEK EMPLOYMENT CONDITIONS

The predominant occupations of male youth age 16-21 during the 1980 survey week were service work, laborers, operatives and craftspersons (Table 2.10). These occupations employed about seven out of every ten males. Among employed females, clerical and service occupations accounted for 70 percent of the jobs in the 1980 survey week. For the most part, the occupations held by youth age 16-21 did not vary between survey years.

The distribution by industry for employed youth in the two survey years (Table 2.11) shows that in both 1979 and 1980, retail trade, manufacturing, and eating and drinking places generated over half of the jobs for males, while retail trade, professional services, and eating and drinking places accounted for nearly 60 percent of the jobs for females. Among males, slightly more whites and Hispanics were employed in manufacturing than blacks. Eating and drinking places, however, provided more employment for blacks and Hispanics than for whites, while retail trade generated more employment for whites.

Table 2.10 Occupational Distribution of Employed Youth Age 16-21 in 1979 and 1980 Survey by Sex and Race

	Black				Hispanic				White				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80
Professional, technical	3	4	2	3	2	3	2	3	4	5	5	4	4	4	4	4
Managers, administrators	2	1	1	1	4	2	0	1	3	4	3	2	3	3	2	2
Sales workers	3	2	7	5	2	3	10	9	5	4	9	9	5	4	9	8
Clerical	9	13	44	44	9	8	45	46	7	8	37	39	8	9	38	40
Craft and kindred workers	9	10	1	1	15	13	1	1	15	16	1	1	15	16	1	1
Operatives, except transportation	14	16	11	9	22	23	14	11	16	15	8	8	16	15	8	8
Transportation, operatives	6	6	1	1	4	4	0	0	5	5	0	1	5	5	0	1
Laborers, except farm	23	17	3	3	14	19	1	4	20	19	3	2	20	19	3	2
Farmers	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Farm laborers	4	3	1	0	5	4	3	2	5	4	1	1	5	4	1	1
Service workers, except household	28	30	27	30	23	20	19	21	19	20	28	29	20	21	27	29
Private household	0	0	3	3	0	0	5	3	0	0	6	5	0	0	6	4

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=14,100,000) in 1979 and (N=14,200,000) in 1980.

Table 2.11Industry Distribution of Employed Youth Age 16-21 in 1979 and 1980 Survey by Sex and Race

	Black				Hispanic				White				Total			
	Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female		Male		Female	
	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80	79	80
Agriculture, mining	5	4	1	1	7	8	4	3	7	7	2	2	7	7	2	2
Construction	7	8	0	1	8	6	0	1	8	8	1	1	8	8	1	1
Manufacturing, durable goods	9	12	6	3	17	15	8	6	14	12	5	6	14	12	5	6
Manufacturing, nondurable goods	9	8	8	7	8	8	9	10	6	6	6	6	7	7	7	6
Transportation and Communication	5	5	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	2	2	3	3	2	2
Wholesale trade	5	3	1	2	3	2	2	3	3	3	1	2	3	3	1	2
Retail trade	15	11	13	14	14	16	22	21	23	24	21	22	22	22	21	21
Eating and drinking places	15	12	15	16	14	15	10	11	11	12	18	19	11	12	18	18
Finance, insurance and real estate	3	2	7	7	2	3	9	12	2	2	8	7	2	2	8	7
Business and repair services	6	7	3	3	8	10	4	1	8	8	2	3	8	8	2	3
Personal service	4	6	7	6	3	4	7	8	3	3	9	8	3	3	9	8
Entertainment and recreation services	1	4	1	1	2	1	2	1	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2
Professional and related services	14	16	29	31	8	7	18	19	8	8	21	19	8	8	21	20
Public administration	3	4	6	5	3	2	4	3	2	1	2	2	2	2	3	2

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=14,100,000) in 1979 and (N=14,200,000) in 1980.

Among females, retail trade in both survey years continued to generate more jobs for whites and Hispanics than for blacks. Whites were also more likely to be employed in eating and drinking places than either blacks or Hispanics. A greater proportion of black youth than of either whites or Hispanics worked in the professional services industry, which accounts for a large proportion of clerical occupations for females. Table 2.12 presents the mean usual hours worked among employed youth by school enrollment status. As expected, on average, high school dropouts and nonenrolled high school graduates worked full time during the survey week, and high school students and college students worked part time. Nevertheless, in both survey years, high school students averaged about 18 hours of work per week.

SURVEY WEEK WAGE CHANGES

Employed youth age 16-21 earned on average $3.57 an hour in the 1979 survey and $3.84 in the 1980 survey, an 8 percent hourly wage increase. Between 1979 and 1980, the federal minimum wage increased from $2.90 to $3.10 an hour, a 7 percent increase. The average annual change in the Consumer Price Index was nearly 12 percent, however, so in real wages, youth age 16-21 did not experience an increase between survey years.[4]

Table 2.13 presents the mean wage rate by school enrollment status as well as sex and race in 1979 and 1980 and both the relative and absolute changes between survey years. With the exception of nonenrolled high school Hispanic male graduates and black female college students, all youth experienced wage increases. Among males, high school students, with the exception of blacks, experienced the highest percent wage increase. Among

---

[4] U.S. Department of Labor, Monthly Labor Review (Washington, D.C., November, 1980), Table 22.

Table 2.12 Mean Total Hours Worked Per Week by Youth Age 16-21 by School Enrollment Status in 1979 and 1980

	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	Total
Mean total hours worked in 1979	37.0	18.2	22.7	39.4	29.9
Mean total hours worked in 1980	35.8	18.1	21.0	38.8	29.1

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=14,100,000) in 1979 and (N=14,200,000) in 1980.

Table 2.13 Mean Wage Rates of Employed Youth by School Enrollment Status, Sex and Race in 1979 and 1980 Survey

Enrollment status	Female									Male											
	Black			Hispanic			White			Black			Hispanic			White			Total average		
	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase	1979	1980	Increase
High school dropout	2.75	3.25	18%	2.97	3.80	28%	2.99	3.22	8%	3.49	3.54	1%	3.89	4.15	7%	4.05	4.48	11%	3.63	3.92	8%
High school student	2.84	3.08	4%	2.62	3.00	15%	2.64	2.89	9%	3.03	3.40	12%	2.99	3.47	16%	2.88	3.24	13%	2.79	3.11	11%
College student	3.53	3.31	-6%	3.52	3.65	4%	3.24	3.65	13%	3.39	4.08	20%	3.80	3.97	4%	3.83	3.90	2%	3.52	3.75	7%
Nonenrolled high school graduate	3.49	3.62	4%	3.66	3.92	7%	3.67	3.97	8%	4.26	4.51	6%	4.55	4.53	0%	4.73	4.94	4%	4.14	4.40	6%
Total	3.27	3.37	3%	3.26	3.62	11%	3.24	3.53	9%	3.60	3.90	8%	3.79	4.04	7%	3.90	4.17	7%	3.57	3.84	8%

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date, who were employed during survey week in respective year, and for whom the calculated hourly rate of pay is at least $0.25 and does not exceed $10.00.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=14,100,000) in 1979 and (N=14,200,000) in 1980.

females, black and Hispanic high school dropouts and white college students had the highest wage increases.

Table 2.14 shows minority wage rates in both survey years as the percentage of white mean wage rates by sex and school enrollment status. In both survey years, employed black and Hispanic high school students generally had higher mean hourly wage rates than white students, except for female Hispanic high school students who earned nearly as much as whites in 1979 and slightly exceeded the wages of whites in 1980. Among male high school dropouts and nonenrolled high school graduates, whites' average hourly earnings exceeded those of blacks and Hispanics in both survey years. The race difference in average hourly wage rates among females was not as apparent as it was for males. Nonenrolled black and Hispanic high school graduate females trailed white females with a similar educational status in hourly wages. Among high school students, minority females earned nearly the same hourly wages or more than whites. The hourly wage differentials for female dropouts and college students did not produce any clear racial pattern, but varied by survey year and school enrollment status.

CONCLUSIONS

Active participation and high unemployment continue to characterize the youth labor market. The problems of unemployment remain especially acute for younger and minority youth. The decline of national employment in 1980 also affected the employment status of youth. While the NLS unemployment estimates in 1980 did not show dramatic changes from the previous year, the labor force response of youth to worsening conditions did vary: white and Hispanic youth either remained in the labor force or slightly increased their LFPR, but black youth appear to have responded to the recession by dropping out of the labor

Table 2.14 Black and Hispanic Mean Wage Rates as Percentages of White Mean Wage Rates, by Sex and School Enrollment Status in 1979 and 1980

Enrollment status	Female				Male			
	Black/white		Hispanic/white		Black/white		Hispanic/white	
	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980	1979	1980
High school dropout	92.0	100.9	99.3	118.0	86.2	79.0	96.0	92.6
High school student	107.5	106.6	99.2	103.8	105.2	104.9	103.8	107.1
College student	107.7	90.7	108.6	100.0	88.5	104.6	103.7	101.8
Nonenrolled high school graduate	95.1	91.2	99.7	98.7	90.0	91.3	96.2	91.7
Total average	100.9	95.5	100.6	102.5	92.3	93.5	97.2	96.9

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on the interview date, who were employed during survey week in respective year, and for whom the calculated hourly rate of pay is at least $0.25 and does not exceed $10.00.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=14,100,000) in 1979 and (N=14,200,000) in 1980.

force.

The majority of youth who held jobs in 1979 continued to be employed in the second survey year. Unemployed youth, however, are not as predictable: unemployed whites were more likely to be employed in the second survey year than blacks or Hispanics, and blacks were more likely to have dropped out of the labor force than other youth. Unemployed youth who were not successful at locating employment, especially those in school, responded by withdrawing from the labor force.

Finally, the youth labor market continues to offer part-time work in the service, retail, and restaurant industries. Overall, the increase in the average wage between 1979 and 1980 slightly exceeded the federal minimum wage increase between survey years but the increase in the annual rate of inflation out-stripped wage increase for employed youth. These changes in the wage structure show how difficult it is to isolate the impact of minimum wage changes on youth employment.

Appendix 2A

CPS-NLS Differences in Employment Status of Youth Age 16-21 - 1980

The National Longitudinal Surveys (NLS) have generally obtained higher estimates of labor force participation (LFPR), unemployment, and employment/population ratios than the Current Population Survey (CPS).[1] The employment status of NLS youth is estimated using the CPS questions.[2] Nevertheless, the NLS in the 1979 survey obtained a one-sixth higher LFPR than the CPS for youth age 16-21, a 35 percent higher unemployment rate, and an 11 percent higher employment/population ratio. A variety of reasons could explain the CPS-NLS differences, but the most likely explanation is that the NLS interviews the youth directly, whereas CPS assignment of labor force status is usually based on the response of the parent or another responsible adult household member.[3] Support for the proxy response hypothesis was augmented by the evidence from the 1979 survey showing that the CPS-NLS differences were greatest among the youngest youth (age 16-17) and those whose major survey week activity was school.[4]

---

[1] Norman Bowers, "Youth Labor Force Activity: Alternative Survey Compared" Monthly Labor Review (Washington, D.C., U.S. Department of Labor) April 1981.

[2] The NLS uses the CPS questions to determine employment status, but they apply to the week preceeding the interview rather than to a specific week of the month. Only youth between the ages of 16 to 21 years are included in this analysis: as in the CPS, younger youth are not considered. Youth interviewed after May, 1979 (less than three percent) are excluded to control for the large influx of students into the labor force during the summer. These youth are assumed to be distributed proportionately to those who were interviewed prior to the summer.

[3] R. Santos. "Measuring the Employment Status of Youth: CPS-NLS Differences." Proceedings of the Thirty-Third Annual Meeting (Madison, WI: Industrial Relations Research Association, September 1980) pp. 62-68.

[4] Ibid.

A comparison of the CPS-NLS employment data of youth in 1980 is presented in this chapter to examine further whether or not the previous differences between the survey were maintained. Annual changes in the magnitude of the survey differences should also show how youth in both surveys responded to declining employment conditions in early 1980. In 1980 the first five monthly surveys of the CPS showed a slight decline in LFPR, increasing unemployment, and declining employment/population ratios from the first five months in 1979. By comparison, the NLS showed basically no difference in the employment status of youth between the 1979 and 1980 survey. However, both the CPS and NLS indicated a substantial change in the employment status of blacks from the previous year. The LFPR of black youth age 16-21 dropped four percent in the NLS from the previous survey and six percent in the CPS.[5] Unemployment of black youth in the NLS decreased nine percent from 1979, but the CPS showed a 10 percent increase. CPS-NLS differences in employment estimates that occur in the second NLS survey will vary by race. Since the NLS has generally obtained higher employment rates than the CPS for blacks, one would expect the CPS-NLS differences to narrow because of the increase in unemployment noted by the CPS and the decline shown by the NLS.

SURVEY DIFFERENCES BY RACE, SEX, AND AGE

Overall, the higher level in youth LFPR reported by the NLS in the spring of 1979 as compared to the CPS continued to be quite similar in 1980. Survey differences in the employment/population ratio widened in 1980--six points difference in 1979 versus eight points in 1980.[6] Unemployment estimate

[5] Annual employment changes noted for the CPS are for the month of February in 1979 and 1980.

[6] March was the 1979 CPS month used to compare the employment status obtained

differences, however, narrowed between the CPS and NLS in 1980--five points higher in the 1979 NLS versus three points higher in the second survey. On a relative basis, the NLS higher unemployment estimates declined from a 35 percent difference to about a 21 percent difference in 1980. As in 1979, the survey differences were not uniform by race, sex, or age (Tables 2A.1 and 2A.2).[7]

For white males, the difference in employment status reported by the CPS and NLS remained largely unchanged in 1979 and 1980. The survey employment status differences continued to be greatest among youth age 16-17, and among white males of this age the survey differences widened in 1980. Survey differences in LFPR and employment/population ratios for white females widened while unemployment estimates narrowed somewhat.

For blacks, the differences in employment estimates between the CPS and NLS narrowed more dramatically in 1980. The 1980 CPS-NLS convergence in estimating black unemployment occurred largely because the CPS reported an increase in black youth unemployment from 1979 whereas the NLS measured an unemployment decline. The reduction in the CPS-NLS unemployment differences

---

in the 1979 NLS. Approximately 44 percent of the NLS sample was interviewed in March. In the 1980 NLS, 38 percent of the interviews were in February. The CPS month selected to compare the employed status obtained in the 1980 NLS was the modal month February.

[7] In order to compare youth in the NLS sample and the CPS survey, the white and other race cohort and the Hispanic cohort in the NLS sample are combined. Differences between the two "white" groups still exist, however, since about four percent of Hispanics in the CPS survey are classified as black but are considered white in the NLS regrouping. On the other hand, the NLS white group includes other races who in the CPS are combined with blacks. The other races category comprises only about two percent of the whites and 11 percent of the blacks. The NLS and CPS should be quite comparable, but the results of the differences should be to understate slightly the LFPR and employment/population ratios for the NLS white group and to overstate its unemployment rate relative to the CPS. The opposite will occur for blacks, where the only difference between the CPS and NLS group is that the NLS excludes other races and Hispanic blacks.

Table 2A.1 Employment Status, in 1979 Survey by Sex, Race, and Age: Comparison of NLS and CPS[a]

Sex and age	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference
				Black[b]					
Female	60.1	40.4	19.7	41.2	27.3	13.9	35.4	29.4	6.0
16-17	48.1	23.0	25.1	54.6	37.1	17.5	21.9	14.5	7.4
18-19	63.9	41.8	22.1	40.3	26.0	14.3	38.1	30.9	7.2
20-21	67.9	56.8	11.1	32.6	24.2	8.4	45.8	43.1	2.7
Male	71.0	52.0	19.0	36.0	28.7	7.3	45.4	37.1	8.3
16-17	59.6	29.1	30.5	53.5	43.5	10.0	27.7	16.5	11.2
18-19	72.8	56.1	16.7	33.7	27.0	6.7	48.3	40.9	7.4
20-21	82.9	75.8	7.1	22.8	23.2	-0.4	64.0	58.2	5.8
				White[c]					
Female	68.8	59.0	9.8	17.9	11.5	6.4	56.5	52.2	4.3
16-17	61.0	45.9	15.1	25.6	16.2	9.4	45.4	38.4	7.0
18-19	72.8	62.6	10.2	17.7	11.4	6.3	59.9	55.5	4.4
20-21	72.5	68.0	4.5	11.7	8.5	3.2	64.1	62.3	1.8
Male	74.6	65.9	8.7	14.9	13.0	1.9	63.5	57.3	6.2
16-17	64.1	50.3	13.8	24.3	19.6	4.7	48.5	40.4	8.1
18-19	77.6	70.2	7.4	13.0	12.6	0.4	67.5	61.3	6.2
20-21	82.6	77.8	4.8	8.9	8.9	0.0	75.2	70.9	4.3
				Total					
Total	70.8	59.9	10.9	19.1	14.1	5.0	57.3	51.5	5.8
Female	67.6	56.1	11.5	20.7	13.3	7.4	53.6	48.6	5.0
Male	74.1	63.9	10.2	17.6	14.8	2.8	61.1	54.4	6.7

[a] CPS figures are for March 1979.

[b] NLS excludes other races in Black category. CPS includes other races in Black category.

[c] NLS includes all Hispanics and other races in White category. CPS includes white Hispanics but not other races in White category.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Table 2A.2 Employment Status in 1980 Survey, by Sex, Race, and Age: Comparison of NLS and CPS[a]

Sex and age	Labor force participation rate			Percent unemployed			Employment/ population ratio		
	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference
	Black[b]								
Female	57.7	42.2	15.5	38.1	29.6	8.5	35.7	29.8	5.9
16-17	43.6	22.4	21.2	52.9	38.8	14.1	20.5	13.7	6.8
18-19	64.9	47.9	17.0	36.1	38.4	-2.3	41.5	29.5	12.0
20-21	65.1	56.5	8.6	30.0	18.3	11.7	45.6	46.2	-0.6
Male	68.5	46.2	22.3	32.0	34.7	-2.7	46.5	30.2	16.3
16-17	52.8	23.7	29.1	47.1	41.7	5.4	27.9	13.9	14.0
18-19	72.5	52.3	20.2	29.2	37.7	-8.5	51.3	32.6	19.7
20-21	83.8	67.3	18.5	22.9	29.3	-6.4	64.7	47.6	17.1
	White								
Female	68.5	56.7	11.8	16.3	12.0	4.3	57.3	49.9	7.4
16-17	60.5	42.1	18.4	25.3	16.9	8.4	45.2	35.0	10.2
18-19	72.9	61.1	11.8	13.0	12.7	0.3	61.7	53.3	8.4
20-21	74.1	66.2	7.9	12.0	8.4	3.6	65.2	60.6	4.6
Male	76.0	65.3	10.7	17.1	14.7	2.4	63.0	55.7	7.3
16-17	68.4	47.6	20.8	27.1	19.1	8.0	49.9	38.5	11.4
18-19	77.1	69.6	7.5	15.2	14.1	1.1	65.4	59.8	5.6
20-21	82.8	79.1	3.7	10.3	12.6	-2.3	74.2	69.1	5.1
	Total								
Total	71.0	58.4	12.6	18.9	15.6	3.3	57.5	49.3	8.2
Female	67.0	54.4	12.6	18.9	14.2	4.7	54.3	46.7	7.6
Male	75.0	62.5	12.5	18.9	16.9	2.0	60.8	52.0	8.8

[a] CPS figures are for February 1980.

[b] NLS excludes other races in Black category. CPS includes other races in Black category.

[c] NLS includes all Hispanics and other races in White category. CPS includes white Hispanics but not other races in White category.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=24,700,000).

for blacks is concentrated largely among youth age 18-19. Consequently, among older black youth, the CPS unemployment rates at times exceeded the NLS estimates. In addition, LFPR and employment/population ratios generally narrowed for females, but not for males. The NLS continued to show higher LFPR and employment/population ratios than CPS for blacks. Among older black males (age 18 and over), the NLS employment/population ratios substantially exceeded those of the CPS. For older NLS black youth, the employment/population ratios in 1980 were similar to those in 1979, but the CPS showed a decline from the previous year. Hence, the survey differences widened.

SURVEY DIFFERENCE BY MAJOR ACTIVITY

The CPS-NLS differences in employment status in both the 1979 and 1980 survey occur mainly for youth whose major survey week activity was school. (Table 2A.3 and Table 2A.4). NLS youth engaged in all other survey week activities besides school generally have an employment status more similar to the CPS. In the 1980 survey, the CPS and NLS differences in LFPR and employment/population ratios increased slightly for youth whose major activity was school, and unemployment differences declined slightly. For youth engaged in all other activities, LFPR survey differences remain basically the same, unemployment differences narrowed, and the employment/population ratio increased slightly.

For youth whose major survey week activity was school, LFPR and employment/population ratio survey differences increased for both white males and females. Unemployment differences between the two surveys remained nearly the same as those in the previous year. For blacks, however, the LFPR and the unemployment estimates of the CPS and NLS converged in the 1980 survey. The

Table 2A.3 Employment Status, in 1979 Survey by Major Activity, Sex and Race: Comparison of NLS and CPS[a]

Sex and major activity	Labor force participation rate			Unemployment rate			Employment/ population ratio		
	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference
	Black								
Total									
School	50.0	22.1	27.9	55.3	36.9	18.4	22.4	13.9	8.5
All other	78.9	70.5	8.4	29.2	25.2	4.0	55.9	52.8	3.1
Male									
School	52.8	24.1	28.7	55.9	42.8	13.1	23.3	13.8	9.5
All other	87.5	83.6	3.9	25.2	24.1	1.1	65.4	63.4	2.0
Female									
School	47.2	20.0	27.2	54.5	29.9	24.6	21.5	14.0	7.5
All other	71.2	59.7	11.5	33.5	26.4	7.1	47.3	44.0	3.3
	White								
Total									
School	53.6	40.1	13.5	25.3	17.2	8.1	40.0	33.2	6.8
All other	85.7	83.3	2.4	12.0	10.0	2.0	75.4	74.9	0.5
Male									
School	53.2	40.3	12.9	23.8	18.5	5.3	40.5	32.9	7.6
All other	92.7	91.3	1.4	10.6	10.6	0	82.9	81.7	1.2
Female									
School	54.0	39.8	14.2	26.9	15.8	11.1	39.4	33.5	5.9
All other	79.4	75.8	3.6	13.5	9.5	4.0	68.7	68.7	0.0
	Total								
Total									
School	53.1	37.2	15.9	29.3	19.0	10.3	37.5	30.2	7.3
All other	84.8	81.4	3.4	14.0	12.0	2.0	72.9	71.7	1.2
Male									
School	53.1	37.8	15.3	28.1	20.9	7.2	38.2	29.9	8.3
All other	92.0	90.3	1.7	12.3	12.3	0.0	80.7	79.2	1.5
Female									
School	53.0	36.6	16.4	30.6	17.0	13.6	36.7	30.4	6.3
All other	78.3	73.4	4.9	15.8	11.6	4.2	65.9	64.9	1.0

[a] CPS figures are for March 1979.

[b] NLS excludes other races in Black category. CPS includes other races in Black category.

[c] NLS includes all Hispanics and other races in White category. CPS includes white Hispanics but not other races in White category.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date. (N=24,580,000)

Table 2A.4 Employment Status in 1980 Survey, by Major Activity, Sex and Race: Comparison of NLS and CPS[a]

Sex and major activity	Labor force participation rate			Unemployment rate			Employment/ population ratio		
	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference	NLS	CPS	Difference
				Black					
Total									
School	46.3	21.2	25.1	52.1	40.0	12.1	22.2	12.7	9.5
All other	79.4	73.6	5.8	25.1	29.3	-4.2	59.5	52.0	7.5
Male									
School	47.6	20.9	26.7	49.4	42.3	7.1	24.1	12.1	12.0
All other	89.1	84.3	4.8	22.8	31.9	-9.1	68.8	57.4	11.4
Female									
School	45.0	21.5	23.5	54.7	37.4	17.3	20.3	13.4	6.9
All other	70.3	65.4	4.9	27.7	26.7	1.0	50.8	47.9	2.9
				White					
Total									
School	55.2	38.3	16.9	24.3	15.8	8.5	41.8	32.3	9.5
All other	86.4	83.6	2.8	12.7	12.4	.3	75.4	73.2	2.2
Male									
School	57.2	40.0	17.2	24.5	17.4	7.1	43.2	33.1	10.1
All other	93.4	92.8	.6	12.9	13.5	-.6	81.3	80.3	1.0
Female									
School	53.1	36.5	16.5	24.0	13.9	10.1	40.3	31.4	8.9
All other	80.1	75.2	4.9	12.5	11.2	1.3	70.1	66.8	3.3
				Total					
Total									
School	53.9	35.4	18.5	27.8	18.2	9.6	38.9	29.0	9.9
All other	85.5	82.2	3.3	14.2	14.5	-.3	73.4	70.3	3.1
Male									
School	55.9	36.9	19.0	27.4	19.8	7.6	40.6	29.6	11.0
All other	92.8	91.7	1.1	14.1	15.6	-1.5	79.7	77.4	2.3
Female									
School	51.8	33.9	17.9	28.3	16.5	11.8	37.1	28.3	8.8
All other	78.8	73.8	5.0	14.2	13.2	1.0	67.7	64.0	3.7

[a] See notes for Table 2A.2.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 on interview date (N=24,700,000).

NLS reported in 1979 an unemployment rate nearly 50 percent higher than the CPS for black youth whose major survey week activity was school, but the 1980 NLS estimate was only 30 percent higher. The employment/population ratio difference between CPS and NLS was slightly larger in 1980.

For youth whose major survey activity was not school, the 1979 employment status estimates of the CPS and NLS were similar; in 1980, the CPS actually had higher unemployment estimates than the NLS for black and white males. For black males, the CPS unemployment estimates were 39 percent higher than the NLS. In the case of black females and white males and females, there was no major variation in the unemployment estimates of the CPS and NLS. The NLS continued, however, to report higher LFPR and employment/population ratios than the CPS for these groups.

CONCLUSIONS

Employment status estimates of youth age 16-21 between the CPS and NLS continued to vary in 1980. As a whole, the NLS continued to have higher LFPR, employment/population ratio, and unemployment rates than the CPS. The survey differences in 1980 showed a slight increase in difference regarding LFPR and employment/population ratios but a narrowing of unemployment rate differences. Most of the narrowing in unemployment rates occurred among black youth because the CPS showed an increase in unemployment from the previous year whereas the NLS showed an annual decline in unemployment.

The second NLS survey continued to show that the CPS-NLS differences are greatest in the case of youth age 16-17 and for those whose major survey week activity was school. This finding underscores the most likely reasons the CPS and NLS differ in their employment estimates of youth. For younger youth and those primarily engaged in school activities, the CPS is likely to use proxy interviews to obtain employment estimates. The NLS, however, directly interviews these youth. While no direct test is available to substantiate this hypothesis, the discrepancy in both survey years between the CPS and NLS among the younger youth and those whose major survey week activity is school lends it significant support.

Chapter 3: Race and Sex Differences in the Employment Patterns of Youth

by Tom K. Pollard

Blacks, Hispanics, and white females are on average unemployed more than white males, and they work in lower status and lower paying jobs. These differences begin early in the labor force participation cycle and widen as the participants age. One advantage white males may have is that their early employment patterns have that mixture of job tenure and job mobility which extracts the greatest benefit from early exposure to the labor market. This paper examines whether or not this advantage prevails. We do not examine outcomes, but compare the early employment experiences of white males with those of black and Hispanic males and white females. We will highlight those differences in early employment patterns which show promise as determinants of differential outcomes.

As young persons make the transition from school to work their need and motives for employment change. Therefore, employment patterns should be evaluated differently depending on the stage of the transition at which they occur. For example, a history of high job turnover, sporadic employment, and high unemployment might well be normal for a 17 year old high school student but very serious if experienced by a 22 year old high graduate or dropout. Therefore, race and sex differences in employment patterns will be discussed in the context of three stages in the transition from school to work.

The first stage includes the period when the young person is still in school. For most students flexibility of hours and weeks worked is the most important consideration, with employment stability and career possibilities being less important job characteristics. A steady, relatively high paying job is not as important to later success as gaining broad exposure to the workings of the labor market and possible career options.

Exit from school, either by graduation or dropping out, marks the beginning of the second stage. This is the period of maximum job shopping, turnover, or "knocking around," as employers and workers make decisions on the desirability of new employees and job openings, respectively. During this stage life and career goals are narrowed. For future success job turnover at this stage must begin to involve deliberate search and decisionmaking so that the most beneficial career path can be developed. If the turnover is aimless it will have negative effects on later outcomes.

Although no specific event marks the beginning of the third stage, it is that time when a young worker should begin to settle into year around, full-time, work with a career path in mind. The beginning of this stage should be related to the time since leaving school. To examine the transition into the third stage we will split the out-of-school sample into those age 16-19 and those age 20-23 as of the 1980 survey date; if passing out of one's teenage years coincides with movement into the third stage, the latter age group should exhibit more stable employment patterns than the former. Further, groups who show less desire or ability to settle in by this time should show less difference in employment patterns between the two age groups.[2]

The following study outlines differences by race and sex in employment patterns at each stage of the transition. The sample consists of civilian youth aged 16-21 as of January 1, 1979. The employment measures on which the various demographic groups will be compared are: 1) percentage of the group not working at all during 1979, 2) mean weeks worked at all jobs during 1979,

---

[2] This assumes that cross-sectional age effects are a meaningful representation of the effects of aging among individuals. After more observations of the NLS youth cohort are collected we will be able to test these individual age effects directly.

3) mean number of jobs held during 1979, and 4) a cross tabulation for 1979 of the number of jobs held with total weeks worked for the group. The weeks-worked and jobs-held distributions are collapsed to yield the following simple crosstabulation:

Jobs Held during 1979

		1 job	2 or more jobs
Weeks Employed During 1979	1-38 wks.		
	39-52 wks.		

This interaction of total weeks worked and number of jobs held allows more meaningful distinctions than can be made by considering each measure separately. Those persons working more than 38 weeks (defined here as full-year workers) are certainly the more stable.[3] Further, one can differentiate within the full-year group on the basis of number of employers, those having multiple employers being more mobile (changing employers with little or no time out of employment) and those having only one employer being the more stable (holding one full-year job). Within the less-than-39 week category, those with multiple jobs show more total employment: in addition to holding more jobs, on average this group worked 50 percent more weeks.[4]

---

[3] I am labelling the greater than 38 week category as "full-year" and the less-than-39-weeks category as "part-year" . In normal usage 50-52 weeks is considered full year. Here the terms full and part are used in a relative sense and to apply only to youth in the labor market. The division at 38 weeks was chosen because it separates the two main peaks of the weeks-worked distribution for the entire youth population.

Approaching the same crosstabulation from another angle, we can make important distinctions within the number-of-jobs-held categories on the basis of total weeks worked. Among those holding one job are young people with the most stable employment patterns (those working full-year) and others with the least total weeks worked and the least mobility (those working part-year). Also, the ease of finding new employment once a job is lost can be measured by the amount of nonemployment associated with multiple job holding.

Race differences will be determined by comparing black, Hispanic, and white males. The determination of differences by sex will be based on the comparison of white males and females. There are certainly interactions between the race and sex effects, e.g., black females experience the problems of being black and the problems of being female, as we will see.

RACE DIFFERENCES AMONG MALES

We first consider the employment patterns of males who were high school students throughout 1979. Next we consider the employment patterns of black, Hispanic, and white dropouts and graduates.

---

[4] Among 16-21 year old civilians, not enrolled in school during 1979, the breakdown of weeks worked is the following:

	Mean weeks worked
1-38 weeks	
1 job	18
2+ jobs	26
39-52 weeks	
1 job	51
2+ jobs	49

Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Students

White male high school students had more employment during 1979 than Hispanics or blacks, the disparity for Hispanics being less than that for blacks. Whites were the most likely and blacks the least likely, by a wide margin, to have worked during 1979: 85 percent of white male high school students worked at least one week in 1979 compared to 81 percent of Hispanics and 64 percent of blacks (Table 3.1). Among those students employed during the year whites worked more weeks than blacks or Hispanics: white males worked an average of 34 weeks while Hispanics and blacks averaged 28 weeks (Table 3.2). A larger percentage of whites than blacks or Hispanics worked the full year: 30 percent of the whites who worked, worked 50-52 weeks in 1979, while less than 20 percent of blacks and Hispanics did so. Of white males who worked, 30 percent worked 50 - 52 weeks; less than 20 percent of blacks and Hispanics did so (Table 3.3). Finally, white males were the least likely of the employed students to hold only one job during 1979: 49 percent of whites held one job compared to 55 percent of Hispanics and 73 percent of blacks (Table 3.4).

Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Males No longer in School -- Dropouts

Relative to white dropouts the employment patterns of black dropouts can be characterized as involving much less total employment and less job mobility during the year. Black dropouts were the least likely of the three race groups to work at all during 1979 (Table 3.1) Among those dropouts employed during the year, blacks worked the fewest weeks on average (Table 3.2), were the most likely to hold only one job (Table 3.4), and were the least likely to work the entire year (Table 3.3).

Table 3.1 Percentage Working by Sex, Race and Enrollment Status

	Female				Male				Total
	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	
Not enrolled in high school during 1979									
High school dropout	43.3 (2604)	53.5 (2087)	66.6 (10688)	60.9 (15378)	83.2 (3108)	93.6 (1773)	93.7 (10639)	91.6 (15520)	76.3 (30898)
High school graduate	76.3 (2663)	83.3 (1019)	88.7 (20309)	87.1 (23991)	92.7 (1990)	95.4 (776)	98.9 (17861)	98.1 (20616)	92.2 (44606)
Some college	86.7 (1349)	84.8 (481)	92.0 (7568)	90.9 (9397)	90.5 (576)	94.1 (348)	96.3 (5110)	95.6 (6034)	92.7 (15432)
Enrolled in school part of 1979									
High school dropout	46.3 (727)	67.5 (306)	75.1 (2463)	68.4 (3496)	82.2 (967)	86.5 (451)	89.4 (2592)	87.3 (4009)	78.5 (7505)
High school graduate	75.3 (980)	84.5 (341)	92.3 (5770)	89.6 (7092)	90.3 (901)	81.4 (321)	97.3 (5830)	95.6 (7052)	92.6 (14143)
Some college	83.7 (1403)	90.0 (556)	92.0 (8808)	90.8 (10767)	88.0 (962)	100.0 (452)	97.2 (7299)	96.4 (8712)	93.3 (19479)
Enrolled in school all of 1979									
High school student	57.0 (3119)	70.2 (1293)	83.4 (15423)	78.4 (19835)	63.9 (3421)	81.4 (1600)	84.9 (17485)	81.4 (22505)	80.0 (42340)
High school - college student	78.4 (959)	84.4 (263)	93.3 (5782)	90.9 (7003)	82.3 (624)	97.8 (407)	94.9 (5440)	93.9 (6471)	92.3 (13474)
College student	82.3 (2085)	84.6 (794)	88.0 (13569)	87.1 (16448)	93.7 (1368)	88.8 (727)	94.2 (14838)	94.0 (16933)	90.6 (33381)
Total	(15889)	(7140)	(90380)	(113407)	(13916)	(6844)	(87094)	(107853)	(221258)

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 16-21 years old on January 1, 1979. (Unweighted N=8414; Weighted N=24,658,200.)
Parenthesized figures give weighted sample size of each sex, race and enrollment status category.
Percentage figures are based on the weighted sample.

Table 3.2 Mean Number of Weeks Worked in 1979 by Sex, Race and Enrollment Status

	Female				Male				Total
	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	
Not enrolled in school during 1979									
High school dropout	21.1421 (64)	29.5174 (94)	30.5042 (227)	29.2584 (385)	33.7724 (159)	40.0579 (147)	40.0463 (313)	38.9084 (619)	35.0756 (1004)
High school graduate	38.2734 (121)	38.2613 (66)	41.1967 (438)	40.7941 (625)	42.0255 (107)	44.2407 (64)	46.3931 (378)	45.9177 (549)	43.3143 (1174)
Some college	36.0061 (61)	44.0664 (33)	44.4029 (159)	43.2373 (253)	37.4284 (27)	44.7652 (24)	43.9760 (101)	43.4300 (152)	43.3154 (405)
Enrolled in school part of 1979									
High school dropout	21.8910 (23)	26.2905 (23)	33.7551 (55)	31.4403 (101)	25.4893 (52)	29.9677 (35)	29.7037 (71)	28.4432 (158)	29.6611 (259)
High school graduate	29.8423 (50)	29.2781 (27)	35.4219 (133)	24.4951 (210)	29.8264 (59)	34.7784 (24)	40.3639 (128)	38.8773 (211)	36.7525 (421)
Some college	33.4457 (67)	38.0974 (42)	37.9162 (203)	37.1428 (312)	36.8762 (47)	38.7150 (34)	38.8651 (155)	38.6570 (236)	37.8428 (548)
Enrolled in school all of 1979									
High school student	23.9378 (123)	23.5271 (99)	32.2178 (306)	30.7638 (528)	25.1574 (163)	27.8682 (105)	34.2511 (362)	32.7150 (630)	31.8195 (1158)
High school - college student	24.6270 (50)	30.7138 (23)	33.6929 (123)	32.5203 (196)	26.5912 (36)	32.4926 (33)	31.0906 (96)	30.8029 (165)	31.6821 (361)
College student	31.8819 (98)	31.9632 (58)	33.4524 (290)	33.1952 (446)	27.0702 (69)	28.5564 (51)	31.7585 (298)	31.2513 (418)	32.1726 (864)
Total	30.3209 (658)	32.1042 (465)	36.3756 (1935)	35.4498 (3058)	31.9526 (720)	35.3896 (517)	38.2517 (1902)	37.3610 (3139)	36.4078 (6194)

UNIVERSE: Civilians 16-21 years old on January 1, 1979 who worked at least one week in 1979. (Unweighted N=6874; Weighted N=21,477,200.) Means are based on weighted sample. Parenthesized figure gives unweighted sample size of each category.

Table 3.3 Distribution of Weeks Worked for Males by Race and Enrollment Status

(Percentage distributions)

Weeks worked	Black					Hispanic					White				
	1-18 wks.	19-38 wks.	39-49 wks.	50-52 wks.	N	1-18 wks.	19-38 wks.	39-49 wks.	50-52 wks.	N	1-18 wks.	19-38 wks.	39-49 wks.	50-52 wks.	N
Not enrolled in school during 1979															
High school dropout	23.9	28.9	17.2	30.0	2585	16.6	17.8	16.4	49.2	1661	14.9	19.2	23.4	42.4	9971
High school graduate	13.0	12.7	22.2	52.2	1845	7.4	10.4	23.2	59.0	730	3.7	12.1	19.2	65.1	17657
Some college	16.7	31.1	20.6	31.7	521	7.3	16.3	19.2	57.1	328	7.9	16.5	11.7	63.9	4920
Enrolled in school part of 1979															
High school dropout	34.3	46.3	7.8	11.5	794	37.1	40.7	6.9	15.4	390	27.7	38.7	19.9	13.7	2318
High school graduate	30.9	33.6	13.3	22.2	814	21.8	28.8	26.9	22.4	261	9.7	27.3	17.9	45.1	5670
Some college	11.5	39.2	19.8	29.4	848	16.3	18.9	19.9	45.0	452	6.4	37.8	20.6	35.2	7098
Enrolled in school all of 1979															
High school student	46.8	24.2	11.3	17.8	2184	38.5	28.5	13.9	19.1	1302	25.6	25.8	18.3	30.4	14845
High school - college student	35.3	39.1	15.0	10.6	513	28.4	31.8	11.9	27.9	398	28.2	39.4	10.5	21.8	5165
College student	42.8	32.5	8.9	15.9	1282	43.8	17.0	13.0	26.2	646	34.4	23.5	15.7	26.4	13986
Total	29.1	28.7	15.3	27.0	11396	24.8	21.9	16.3	37.1	6168	17.5	23.4	18.0	41.1	81628

UNIVERSE: Male civilians 16-21 years old on January 1, 1979 who worked for at least one week in 1979. (Unweighted N=2485; Weighted N=11,039,200.) N column gives total number working for each enroll-race category.

Table 3.4 Percentage Holding Only One Job During 1979 by Sex, Race and Enrollment Status

	Female				Male				Total
	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	Black	Hispanic	White	Total	
Not enrolled in school during 1979									
High school dropout	66.1 (1214)	58.0 (1200)	50.4 (7903)	53.1 (10317)	51.4 (3018)	54.2 (1804)	35.8 (11196)	40.8 (16017)	45.6 (26333)
High school graduate	69.9 (2208)	67.7 (956)	60.1 (19509)	61.4 (22673)	57.3 (2253)	58.7 (780)	52.3 (19690)	53.0 (22722)	57.2 (45394)
Some college	54.3 (1236)	40.1 (417)	54.5 (7507)	53.8 (9160)	54.2 (594)	52.8 (421)	52.7 (5165)	52.9 (6180)	53.4 (15340)
Enrolled in school part of 1979									
High school dropout	74.1 (354)	55.8 (232)	30.7 (2138)	38.5 (2724)	48.0 (826)	51.1 (451)	19.4 (2828)	28.7 (4106)	32.6 (6829)
High school graduate	59.8 (803)	40.8 (323)	35.6 (5703)	38.7 (6830)	50.9 (866)	45.3 (288)	33.3 (6451)	35.8 (7605)	37.1 (14434)
Some college	48.9 (1308)	39.5 (562)	34.1 (9758)	36.0 (11629)	33.7 (914)	26.7 (482)	39.6 (7969)	38.3 (9364)	37.0 (20992)
Enrolled in school all of 1979									
High school student	61.0 (2032)	64.4 (1038)	48.5 (13794)	51.0 (16863)	61.0 (2491)	57.5 (1363)	49.4 (16457)	51.4 (20311)	51.2 (37174)
High school - college student	62.8 (789)	48.8 (230)	39.5 (6220)	42.4 (7238)	54.4 (602)	54.5 (458)	52.2 (5803)	52.5 (6862)	47.3 (14100)
College	51.7 (1845)	52.0 (701)	34.5 (13470)	37.2 (16015)	49.8 (1439)	49.8 (657)	45.2 (16008)	45.7 (18104)	41.7 (34119)
Total	60.1 (11789)	55.5 (5658)	46.0 (86002)	48.2 (103448)	52.9 (13003)	52.3 (6704)	45.1 (91565)	46.4 (111271)	47.3 (214716)

UNIVERSE: Civilians 16-21 years old on January 1, 1979 who worked at least one week during 1979. (Unweighted N=6874; Weighted N=21,477,200.) Percentages are based on weighted sample. Parenthesized figures show weighted sample size of each category.

Hispanic males show a different pattern relative to whites. They were equally likely to work (Table 3.1) and, among those employed, worked more weeks on average (Table 3.2) and were more likely than employed whites to have worked the entire year (Table 3.3). Hispanics were, however, less likely than whites to have held multiple jobs during the year Table 3.4).

Hispanic and white male dropouts averaged 40 weeks worked during the year, and blacks averaged 33 weeks (Table 3.2). Hispanics were more likely than blacks or whites to have worked 50-52 weeks--49 percent of Hispanics as opposed to 42 percent of whites and 30 percent of blacks (Table 3.3). On the other end of the distribution, 24 percent of blacks worked less than 18 weeks compared to 15 percent of whites and 17 percent of Hispanics.

Although white and Hispanic males worked a similar number of weeks, on average whites were much more likely to hold multiple jobs. Sixty-four percent of whites, 49 percent of blacks, and 46 percent of Hispanics held two or more jobs during 1979 (Table 3.4).

To show the differences by race in the effects of aging on employment patterns of dropouts, we divide them into two age groups, those age 16-19 and those age 20-23 as of the 1980 NLS survey date. Further, to get an idea of differences in employment patterns we describe those patterns using the interaction of the total weeks worked and total jobs held distributions for 1979 (See page 49 for an explanation of this crosstabulation).

Although whites and Hispanics in the younger age group work a similar number of weeks during the year, job mobility among whites is greater. The greater likelihood of whites to hold multiple jobs holds both for full and part-year workers (Table 3.5).

Black dropouts age 16-19 were more likely than their Hispanic or white counterparts to hold but one job during the year and twice as likely as whites

Table 3.5 Weeks Worked and Jobs Held in 1979 by Male High School Dropouts, by Race and Age

Age	Black			Hispanic			White			All races		
	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23
1-38 weeks												
1 job	32.3	24.2	26.7	24.6	10.5	15.1	15.9	8.3	11.2	19.3	11.7	14.5
2+	27.2	25.7	26.2	24.7	16.1	18.9	31.8	17.3	22.9	30.3	18.8	23.0
39-52 weeks												
1 job	24.6	27.1	26.3	19.5	50.4	40.2	13.1	35.2	26.7	15.5	35.5	28.2
2+	16.0	23.0	20.8	31.2	23.0	25.7	39.3	39.1	39.2	34.9	33.9	34.3
1-38 weeks	59.5	49.9	52.8	49.4	26.6	34.1	47.6	25.6	34.1	49.6	30.6	37.5
39-52 weeks	40.5	50.1	47.2	50.6	73.4	65.9	52.4	74.4	65.9	50.4	69.4	62.5
1 job	56.8	51.3	53.0	44.1	60.9	55.3	29.0	43.6	37.9	34.8	47.2	42.7
2+	43.2	48.7	47.0	55.9	39.1	44.7	71.0	56.4	62.1	65.2	52.8	57.3
Total (00s)	794	1791	2585	545	1108	1653	3854	6117	9971	5193	9015	14208

UNIVERSE: Male civilians who:
1) were 16-23 years old on survey date 1980
2) were high school dropouts
3) were not enrolled in school during 1979
and 4) worked at least one week in 1979.
(Unweighted N=618; Weighted N=1,430,900.)

to hold only one part-year job (Table 3.5). This is evidence that among blacks a job lost during the year is less likely to be replaced. Among Hispanics and whites some difficulty in job finding is shown by the percentage of multiple job holders who work part-year--37 percent of the whites and 42 percent of the Hispanics who held multiple jobs worked part-year.

Thirty-two percent of blacks, 25 percent of Hispanics, and 16 percent of whites held one part-year job. Blacks are also the most likely to hold one full-year job. Twenty-five percent of blacks held one full-year job, compared to 20 percent of Hispanics and 13 percent of whites (Table 3.5).

Among male dropouts age 20-23 the full-year multiple job holding of whites contrasts with the full-year single job holding of Hispanics. Seventy percent of both whites and Hispanics worked full year, but 50 percent of the Hispanics working full year held a single job compared to 35 percent of whites. Overall Hispanics were more lakely to hold a single job during the year, 60 percent of Hispanic workers held one job while only 44 percent of whites did so.

Black dropouts show improvement with age in their employment patterns, but are still behind whites and Hispanics. Only 50 percent of 20-23 year old black employed dropouts worked a full year compared to 70 percent among whites and Hispanics. Further, blacks were 2.5 times as likely as Hispanics and 3 times as likely as whites to have held only one part-year job, and were least likely of the three race groups to have held one full-year job. Job changing problems suffered by blacks are reflected in their greater representation than Hispanics or whites in the multiple-job part-year category (Table 3.5).

In general as the dropouts age the percentage of workers holding multiple jobs rises for blacks and falls for whites and Hispanics, with Hispanics more likely than whites settle into single-job full-year employment.

Race Differences in the Employment Patterns of Males No Longer in School--High School Graduates

Within each race group graduates have substantially more stable employment patterns than dropouts, with the greatest improvement among blacks.[4] Black graduates show the greatest advantage over dropouts in the percentage working during the year (Table 3.1) and weeks worked during the year (Table 3.2).

For all races the percentage of graduates holding a single job during the year is higher than for dropouts. Whites show the greatest increase of graduates over dropouts in single job holding, and they remain less likely than blacks or Hispanics to hold a single job during the year (Table 3.4).

In the differences between dropouts and graduates, Hispanics were very similar to whites. However, among full year workers Hispanic graduates were more mobile than dropouts while among whites the opposite was true. A greater percentage of Hispanic graduates than dropouts held multiple jobs for a total greater than 38 weeks. Among whites the trend is in the other direction with graduates being less likely than dropouts to hold multiple jobs full-year (Table 3.6).

The comparison of employment patterns among graduates by race shows that while whites and Hispanics have similar employment patterns, blacks show more long term unemployment and less mobility. Among graduates blacks are still substantially less likely than whites or Hispanics to work full year (Table 3.3); most likely to hold a single, part-year, job (Table 3.6); and least

---

[4] It remains to be seen whether this improvement leads to future improvements in relative outcomes. It may be simply that blacks who graduate are a more select group among all blacks than white graduates are among all whites, in which case relative black/white outcomes would remain unaffected.

Table 3.6 Weeks Worked and Jobs Held in 1979 by Male High School Graduates (Not Enrolled in 1979) by Race and Age

Age	Black			Hispanic			White			All races		
	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23
1-38 weeks												
1 job	*	14.6	14.6	*	5.6	6.9	11.3	6.9	7.5	11.9	7.6	8.1
2+	*	16.5	15.9	*	11.3	12.9	15.7	9.4	10.1	15.7	10.1	10.8
39-52 weeks												
1 job	*	47.1	46.0	*	55.1	54.2	35.1	48.0	46.5	35.9	48.2	46.7
2+	*	21.8	23.5	*	28.0	26.0	37.9	35.6	35.9	36.5	34.1	34.4
1-38 weeks	*	31.1	30.2	*	16.9	19.8	27.0	16.3	17.6	27.5	17.7	18.9
39-52 weeks	*	68.9	69.5	*	83.1	80.2	73.0	83.7	82.4	72.5	82.3	81.1
1 job	*	61.7	60.6	*	60.7	61.1	46.4	55.0	53.9	47.8	55.8	54.8
2+	*	38.3	39.4	*	39.3	38.9	53.6	45.0	46.1	52.2	44.2	45.2
Total (00s)	303	2064	2366	128	918	1046	2731	19840	22571	3161	22822	25983

UNIVERSE: Male civilians who:
1) were 16-23 years old on survey date 1980
2) were high school graduates
3) were not enrolled in school during 1979
and 4) worked at least one week in 1979.
(Unweighted N=699; Weighted N=2,598,300.)

likely to have worked the full year at multiple jobs. Hispanics were the most likely to hold one full-year job and less likely than whites to hold multiple jobs totalling more than 38 weeks.

Summary of Differences by Race

White male students were more likely than black or Hispanic students to work while in high school, and among working students, whites tended to hold more jobs and to work more weeks during the year. Black students showed the weakest attachment to employment, being the least likely to have worked and, among those employed the most likely to have held a single short-term job during the year.

Among dropouts, whites and Hispanics were equally likely to have worked during 1979. Hispanic dropouts tended to work more total weeks than whites, but were much less likely than whites to hold multiple jobs during the year. Blacks dropouts, like students, were chronically out of work and had the least job mobility during the year, once again showing the weakest employment patterns of the three race groups. As dropouts age, whites and Hispanics show decreasing turnover while turnover among blacks increases. This could indicate for blacks the beginning of a delayed period of job search or only a failure relative to whites and Hispanics to settle into stable employment as they age.

The employment patterns of black graduates showed more improvement over those of dropouts than was the case for whites or Hispanics, but black graduates are still less likely to work than whites, the least likely graduates to work full-year, and the most likely to work less than 39 weeks during the year.

These findings cast doubt on the image of minority workers as having on average higher turnover than whites with many short spells of unemployment.

Blacks show themselves to be chronically nonemployed and less able than whites to find a second job if one is lost. If a clue is to be found here to the relatively disadvantaged position of Hispanics, it is that they are too stable, working full-year but not having an amount of job search and turnover early in their labor market careers sufficient to place them on the most beneficial career paths. This lack of turnover may not be voluntary but may be due to economic necessity or to the fact that the complete exclusion from better opportunities has discouraged the young Hispanic workers from searching from better opportunities.

DIFFERENCES BY SEX IN EMPLOYMENT PATTERNS

Some researchers attribute the difference in patterns of adult males and females to their differing roles in marriage . Other researchers, applying the dual labor market framework, emphasize that the jobs which are open to adult women and in which adult women are concentrated are dead-end and encourage high turnover--that such jobs do not reward stability, do not provide wage increases, training, and exposure to internal and external career paths in exchange for stable employment. Regardless of which of these frameworks is more applicable, it is a certainty that for males and females alike early employment patterns determine to a large extent later alternatives in the labor market and therefore the choices open to and made by each group.

Males and females show different employment patterns at each stage of the transition from school to work. Male and female students work about the same amount during the year, but the characteristics of the jobs they hold varies greatly by sex. The common reasons for which females drop out of high school, marriage and/or pregnancy, family responsibilities, etc., are more likely to cause them to move from school into a category of lower labor force participation and employment than males. Such moves by females are not based on economic decision making, and are often followed by a reentry later at a distinct disadvantage to their male counterparts. A very large percentage of female graduates,comparable to that for males, enters the labor market upon leaving high school. But as the time since school increases, female graduates begin to exit and/or develop employment patterns less stable than those of males. The labor market decisions made by graduates are based more on conditions in the labor market than are the decisions of dropouts.

The differing male/female employment patterns among students, dropouts, and high school graduates will be examined in the following sections in an attempt to better understand how early differences in employment pattterns might contribute to differences in labor market outcomes later in life. The discussion will center on white males and females. In spite of the fact that the employment data for females reflects the same differences by race as that for males, the male/female differentials are similar for the three race groups. Differences by race which do exist in the male/female differentials will be highlighted.

Differences by Sex Among Students

Among high school students white males were only slightly more likely than white females to have worked during the year, with the differential somewhat greater among blacks and Hispanics. Eighty-three percent of females worked for at least one week during 1979 compared to 85 percent of males (Table 3.1). In spite of the relatively low employment rate among black females, the male/female differential was the greatest among Hispanics: 70 percent of Hispanic females and 57 percent of black females worked for at least a week during the year, compared to 81 percent of Hispanic males and 64 percent of black males.

Among high school students who worked, males and females within each race group showed very similar patterns of employment. On all measures, average weeks worked, probability of working full year, probability of holding a single job during the year, etc., males showed only a slight advantage. All measures do, however, show graphically the race differentials described in the previous section, whites having the most substantial and blacks the least substantial employment patterns.

In summary, the data show a close similarity in the employment patterns of male and female students. Other work in this volume shows, however, that although the quantity of employment is similar for males and females, occupational, industrial, and wage distributions of males are very different from those of females. Males are exposed to a wider variety of jobs, and wide exposure at this stage is important.[6]

Sex Differences in Employment Patterns Among Out-of-School Youth

The small sex differences in employment patterns among students give way to much larger differences among out-of-school males and females. In general, male and female differences are the greatest among dropouts, less among high school graduates, and least among out-of-school youth with college experience. Among out-of-school whites the male/female difference in the percentage employed during 1979 is 27 percentage points among dropouts (94 percent for males vs 67 percent for females), 10 percentage points among high school graduates (99 percent of white males vs 89 percent of white females), and 4 percentage points among whites with some college experience (96 percent of white males vs 92 percent of white females) (Table 3.1). The male/female differentials in employment rates are about the same among blacks and Hispanics and they show the same effect of education.[7]

---

[6] See Chapter 2 of this report for data on male/female differences in the occupational distribution of students.

Further, the data show that among females the employment patterns of students are more substantial than those of dropouts, but male dropouts show more substantial employment patterns than male students. This is a reflection of females being more likely to drop out of school due to marriage and/or pregnancy, which also causes them to leave the labor force, while males are more likely to begin work relatively soon after dropping out.

Among those out-of-school youth employed during the year, the male/female gap in total weeks worked is dependent on educational attainment (Table 3.2). The gap between white male and female dropouts averages 10 weeks, the gap among high school graduates is 5 weeks, and those who have some college show no differential in weeks worked.

The weeks-worked distributions of male and female high school graduates, relative to those of dropouts, are more skewed toward full-year work and the male and female distributions are more similar. Forty-two percent of white male dropouts worked 50-52 weeks compared to 24 percent of white female dropouts. Sixty-five percent of white females and 33 percent of white male dropouts worked less than 39 weeks. Sixty-five percent of white male graduates and 52 percent of white female graduates worked 50-52 weeks (Tables 3.3 and 3.7).

Among those youth with some college the distributions of weeks worked are

---

[7] As was the case with male dropouts, black female dropouts are much less likely than whites to have worked with the percentage for Hispanic females in between: 43 percent of black female dropouts were employed during 1979 compared to 54 percent of Hispanic female dropouts and 67 percent of white female dropouts.

Table 3.7 Distribution of Weeks Worked by Females in 1979 by Race and Enrollment Status

(Percentage distributions)

Weeks worked	Black 1-18 wks.	Black 19-38 wks.	Black 39-49 wks.	Black 50-52 wks.	Black N	Hispanic 1-18 wks.	Hispanic 19-38 wks.	Hispanic 39-49 wks.	Hispanic 50-52 wks.	Hispanic N	White 1-18 wks.	White 19-38 wks.	White 39-49 wks.	White 50-52 wks.	White N
Not enrolled in school during 1979															
High school dropout	54.4	26.4	10.7	8.4	1129	36.4	24.9	19.0	19.8	1117	30.1	35.3	10.2	24.4	7118
High school graduate	18.5	20.1	18.0	43.4	2031	23.9	15.4	12.6	48.1	849	12.3	18.2	17.2	52.4	18002
Some college	21.1	23.3	19.9	35.7	1170	8.1	9.4	30.7	51.8	408	7.0	13.9	20.2	58.9	6963
Enrolled in school part of 1979															
High school dropout	47.5	30.2	13.0	9.4	337	39.6	32.2	12.9	15.4	207	14.7	49.7	13.5	22.0	1849
High school graduate	30.2	28.8	19.0	21.9	738	13.8	68.1	8.7	9.4	288	14.4	41.2	17.9	26.5	5325
Some college	25.9	26.3	19.7	28.2	1175	18.1	20.5	28.3	33.0	500	12.6	34.2	19.8	33.4	8103
Enrolled in school all of 1979															
High school student	47.2	30.4	6.7	15.6	1779	48.0	28.9	14.2	8.9	909	25.2	35.4	14.9	24.5	12866
High school college student	45.8	32.4	13.5	8.3	751	28.7	27.4	13.2	30.7	222	16.5	41.4	20.6	21.5	5395
College student	31.9	24.6	21.5	22.0	1715	29.3	31.0	11.7	28.1	1402	24.3	34.5	15.0	26.2	11945
Total	33.8	25.9	15.9	24.4	10825	30.0	26.0	16.9	27.1	5171	18.0	30.3	16.6	35.1	77586

UNIVERSE: Female civilians 16-21 years old on January 1, 1979, who worked for at least one week in 1979. (Unweighted N=3389; Weighted N=10,437,900.)
The N column of the table gives sample size of those working in each enroll-race category.

more similar still: 64 percent of white males and 59 percent of white females with some college worked 50-52 weeks. Further, white males with some college were more likely than their white female counterparts to have worked less than 39 weeks in 1979 (Tables 3.3 and 3.7).

Blacks and Hispanics show similar employment differentials by sex, but again black employment is at a lower level than that of Hispanics or whites.[8] The effects of education on the employment distributions of blacks and Hispanics are similar.[9]

It would appear, then, that graduation from high school narrows the post-school male/female employment differential and some college experience erases the differential entirely. However, this phenomenon is due at least in part to the nature of our data: because our sample is a crossection of youth during the transition from school to work, those with the most education have had the least exposure to their opportunities in the labor market. We know, further, that female high school graduates tend to enter the labor market immediately upon leaving school and then filter out as time since school increases, whereas female dropouts tend to follow the opposite pattern. Therefore, as the time since leaving school increases for these young women, we should see a decrease in the positive effect of educational attainment on employment.

---

[8] Eight percent of black female dropouts and 30 percent of black male dropouts worked 50-52 weeks while 80 percent of the former and 53 percent of the latter group worked less than 39 weeks. The distribution for Hispanics was closer to that of whites with 20 percent of Hispanic female dropouts and 50 percent of Hispanic male dropouts working 50-52 weeks and 61 percent of the former and 35 percent of the latter working less than 39 weeks.

[9] Of interest, however, is the fact that, as was the case for black males, black females show the largest difference between dropouts and graduates in the percentage working 50-52 weeks (8 percent vs 43 percent).

The distribution by age of male and female dropouts and graduates across the four weeks employed/number-of-jobs-held categories, presented for males in Tables 3.5 and 3.6 and for females in Tables 3.8 and 3.9, allows the comparison of male and female aging effects among dropouts and graduates separately.

Comparison of the data in Tables 3.5 and 3.8 present evidence of the obvious basic difference in labor market experience among male and female dropouts, ages 16-19. Males were more likely to work more than 38 weeks and more likely to hold multiple jobs: 52 percent of white male dropouts age 16-19 worked more than 38 weeks and 71 percent held multiple jobs while only 26 percent of their female counterparts worked more than 38 weeks and only 57 percent held multiple jobs. Further, most female multiple jobholding totalled less than 38 weeks. Females were much more likely than males to hold a single, part-year job (36 percent vs 16 percent). Male dropouts were much more likely to be in the most mobile category, i.e., holding multiple jobs totalling more than 38 weeks.[10]

By moving now to 20-23 year old white dropouts, we get an indication of the effect of aging on the male/female differential among dropouts. By all accounts females improve their position relative to males, but they still fall far behind (Tables 3.5 and 3.8). Relative to the younger age group, both males and females have a higher percentage working full-year, fewer holding multiple jobs, fewer holding only one part-year job, and more holding one

---

[10] Relative to white and Hispanic females, black females were much more likely to show chronic nonemployment (61 percent of black female dropouts age 16-19 held only a single part year job compared to 37 percent of their Hispanic and 36 percent of their white female counterparts). Hispanic female dropouts, on the other hand, were much more likely than blacks or whites to work for more than 38 weeks during 1979 and also most likely to have had a single full-year job.

Table 3.8 Weeks Worked and Jobs Held in 1979 by Female High School Dropouts by Race and Age

Age	Black			Hispanic			White			All races		
	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23
1-38 weeks												
1 job	61.2	50.3	54.5	36.6	38.8	37.8	35.6	26.1	30.2	38.5	30.7	34.0
2+	23.9	27.4	26.1	22.6	23.3	23.0	39.0	32.5	35.3	35.4	30.8	32.7
39-52 weeks												
1 job	3.5	18.7	12.8	18.3	22.1	20.5	7.1	27.4	18.7	8.1	25.7	18.2
2+	11.4	3.6	6.6	22.5	15.8	18.7	18.3	14.0	15.8	18.1	12.8	15.1
1-38 weeks	85.1	77.7	80.6	59.2	62.1	60.8	74.5	58.6	65.5	73.8	61.5	66.7
39-52 weeks	14.9	22.3	19.4	40.8	37.9	39.2	25.5	41.4	34.5	26.2	38.5	33.3
1 job	64.7	68.9	67.3	54.9	60.9	58.3	42.7	53.5	48.9	46.5	56.4	52.2
2+	35.3	31.1	32.7	45.1	39.1	41.7	57.3	46.5	51.1	53.5	43.6	47.8
Total (00s)	429	683	1112	482	623	1105	3052	4052	7103	3963	5358	9320

UNIVERSE: Female civilians who:
1) were 16-23 years old on survey date 1980
2) were high school dropouts
3) were not enrolled in school during 1979
and 4) worked at least one week in 1979.
(Unweighted N=381; Weighted N=932,000.)

full-year job. With increasing age, the gap between male and female dropouts in representation in the most mobile category (multiple jobs totalling more than 38 weeks) remains constant, but relative to males, females become more and more likely to hold a single part-year job. Age narrows the male/female gap in the percentage holding a single full-year job, but females remain less likely to be in this category. Age also narrows the gap between male and female dropouts in the total percentage working more than 38 weeks.

Among graduates age 16-19, white males and females have very similar employment patterns (Tables 3.6 and 3.9). A slightly larger percentage of employed females than males worked more than 38 weeks--78 percent versus 73 percent. Females show a greater representation in the most stable category, those holding a single full-year job. Males and females were equally likely to hold a single part year job, but males did show a slightly higher representation in the most mobile category, i.e., those holding multiple jobs totalling more than 38 weeks.

Moving to the 20-23 year old high school graduates, we see a deterioration in white female employment, both absolutely and relative to white male graduates. Relative to female graduates age 16-19, the older group is less likely to work full-year, less likely to hold a single full year job, and more likely to hold a single part-year job (Table 3.9). Males, on the other hand, show the opposite movements with age, increasing their representation in the full year categories, especially in the one job full year category (Table 3.6).

Summary of Differences by Sex

Male/female differences in employment patterns vary greatly by educational enrollment status and attainment. Among students the employment patterns of males and females are almost identical. For those out of school,

Table 3.9 Weeks Worked and Jobs Held in 1979 by Female High School Graduates (Not Enrolled in 1979) by Race and Age

Age	Black			Hispanic			White			All races		
	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23	16-19	20-23	16-23
1-38 weeks												
1 job	*	28.7	27.9	*	23.9	25.7	11.4	19.6	18.6	13.3	20.8	19.9
2+	*	11.6	12.5	*	7.1	6.5	11.0	8.9	9.2	11.5	9.1	9.4
39-52 weeks												
1 job	*	41.3	39.1	*	37.2	34.4	47.9	41.2	42.0	44.0	41.0	41.4
2+	*	18.4	20.5	*	31.8	33.5	29.7	30.3	30.2	31.1	29.1	29.3
1-38 weeks	*	40.3	40.4	*	31.0	32.2	22.4	28.5	27.8	24.9	29.9	29.3
39-52 weeks	*	59.7	59.6	*	69.0	67.8	77.6	71.5	72.2	75.1	70.1	70.7
1 job	*	70.0	67.0	*	61.2	60.0	59.3	60.8	60.6	57.3	61.8	61.3
2+	*	30.0	33.0	*	38.8	40.0	40.7	39.2	39.4	42.7	38.2	38.7
Total (00s)	354	2827	3182	97	1159	1256	3138	21843	24981	3589	25830	29419

UNIVERSE: Female civilians who:
1) were 16-23 years old on survey date 1980
2) were high school graduates
3) were not enrolled in school during 1979
and 4) worked at least one week in 1979.
(Unweighted N=876; Weighted N=2,941,900.)

the differentials are greater, the size of the differential being a function of educational attainment. Male/female differences are greatest among dropouts, less among high school graduates, and least among youth with some college experience.

The effects of aging on employment patterns also differ by educational attainment. Generally white female dropouts show an absolute increase in employment stability as they age but a decrease relative to males. Female high school graduates, on the other hand, show a deterioration in the employment patterns as they age, both absolutely and relative to males.

Therefore, one can not talk simply of _the_ difference in male and female employment patterns. The difference between males and females in employment patterns varies greatly by educational enrollment status and attainment and behaves differently over the life cycle for dropouts and graduates. Females who drop out of high school also tend to leave the labor market while their male counterparts have very high participation and mobility rates. These females then reenter at a later time at a severe disadvantage for having missed this early experience. Female high school graduates follow the opposite pattern, entering the labor market in large numbers. They have substantial employment immediately after graduation but decrease attachment to employment as they age in response not only to marriage and family responsibilities but also to their poor employment opportunities relative to male high school graduates.

Chapter 4

Government Employment and Training Programs: Comparisons of Characteristics, 1978-1979

by Joan E. Crowley

This chapter explores the basic characteristics of the participants in government sponsored employment and training programs and of the services they receive, comparing the results from the first and second waves of the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience youth cohort.[1] The employment programs surveyed are predominately CETA programs, since CETA is by far the largest of the government-sponsored efforts to provide training and subsidized employment to the out-of-work or underemployed population. One of the major goals of the NLS youth study is to evaluate the expanded CETA programs mandated by the Youth Employment and Demonstrations Projects Act of 1977 (U. S. Department of Labor, 1979).

Few major legislative changes were made in government employment programs over the year between surveys, but the implementation of the expanded CETA youth programs and continuing concern over focusing services on those with the greatest need may be reflected in changes in services and participants over the period.

Since the respondents aged one year between interviews, and since in the first round of the NLS age along with the closely related factor of school enrollment were observed to be major influences on the types of programs in which the youths participated, the comparisons presented here will be limited to the age range overlapping the two years, that is, youths age 15 to 21 on

---

[1] A more extensive discussion of the government-sponsored training programs that were evaluated, along with a detailed description of the participants' reports on the nature of the programs, is available in Crowley, 1981.

January 1 of the interview year. This procedure entails dropping the 14 year-olds from the initial interview, and the 22 year-olds from the second.

A program not investigated in the initial round of interviews but included in the second is the Targeted Jobs Tax Credit. Since January, 1979, the State Jobs Services have been authorizing tax credits to employers for a percentage of wages paid to disadvantaged workers who had been certified for the program by designated local agencies (U. S. Department of Labor, 1980, p. 62). For purposes of comparison across years, participants in this program will be described separately from the rest of the sample.

PARTICIPANT CHARACTERISTICS

Table 4.1A shows the characteristics of the program participants as compared to non-participants, based on the reports from the 1980 interview. About half of the participants are white, and two thirds have family incomes above the poverty level. There is a strong tendency for greater participation among the more disadvantaged groups. Relative to their proportions in the population, the poor are three times more likely to participate than are the nonpoor, and participation rates for Hispanics and blacks are respectively three and four times the rate for whites. The age distribution shows a tendency for higher participation rates among the younger age groups, probably reflecting the targeting of some youth programs to those under 19.

Given that low educational attainment is a barrier to adequate employment, it is appropriate that there is a tendency for high school dropouts to have a higher participation level than those from other enrollment groups. There was little or no variation in participation rate by sex or region of the country in which the respondent lived.

The Targeted Jobs Tax Credit program was implemented in 1979. The

Table 4.1A Comparison of Government Employment and Training Participants with Nonparticipants, by Selected Characteristics, 1980 Interview

(Percentage distributions)

Characteristic	Participation rate per 100 population[a]	Participant since last interview[a]	Nonparticipant since last interview[a]	Targeted jobs tax credit participant since last interview[b]	Total
Sex					
Female	6	48	49	48	49
Male	6	52	51	52	51
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Race					
Black	16	36	13	28	14
Hispanic	11	12	6	7	6
White	4	52	81	65	80
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Age					
15	6	14	13	2	14
16-17	8	36	28	27	28
18-19	6	29	29	32	29
20-21	4	21	30	28	29
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Enrollment status					
High school dropout	8	17	12	21	12
High school student	7	49	41	33	41
College student	4	12	18	4	18
Nonenrolled high school graduate	5	22	29	42	29
Total percent	100	100	100	100	100
Region					
Northeast	6	21	21	17	21
North central	6	28	30	29	30
South	6	32	33	30	33
West	7	19	16	24	16
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Number of programs ever					
None	0	0	90	0	85
One	31	49	7	54	10
More than one	56	51	3	46	5
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Below poverty as defined by CPS	15	35	13	30	14
Above poverty as defined by CPS	5	65	87	70	86
Total percent		100	100	100	100
Percent of sample		6	94	100	100

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-21 on January 1, 1979 (N=26,800,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-22 on January 1, 1980 and who received certificate (tax program) (N=137,000).

characteristics of the respondents who said they had been certified for the program are shown separately in column 4 of Table 4.1A.[2] Compared to other programs, participants in the tax credit program were less disadvantaged relative to the general population. That is, the tax credit program tended to serve whites, older youth, and the nonpoor in greater proportions than did the employment programs. This pattern echoes the analysis of the 1979 interview, which showed that those programs placing respondents directly into jobs characteristically tended to go to participants with the fewest barriers to employment (Crowley, 1981). According to that analysis, the more disadvantaged groups tended to receive education and training services rather than job placements. This pattern is consistent with the allocation of training resources to upgrading those with the lowest levels of skills, while focusing on job placement for the more job ready; the pattern is also consistent with the practice of "creaming" or selecting out the most attractive clients into the most desirable services.

The characteristics of participants were virtually identical in 1979 and 1980 (Table 4.1B). The younger age profile reflects a slight increase in the proportion of high school students served. The two largest differences in the cross-year comparisons of program participants can be traced more to the survey periods than to actual program change. One apparent difference is in the proportion of those who have participated in more than one program. In 1979, somewhat over a third of the participants reported having been in more

---

[2] Approximately one quarter of those receiving certification for the program report actually obtaining a job through the tax credits program. It was decided to define participation in the program as receiving the certification, regardless of the outcome in terms of employment. This definition may to some extent overstate the extent of participation in the program, but it avoids confounding program participation with availability of jobs or the "employability" of the participant.

Table 4.1B Comparison of Government Employment and Training Participants with Nonparticipants, by Selected Characteristics, 1979 Interview

(Percentage distributions)

Characteristic	Participation rate per 100 population	Participant since 1/1/78	Nonparticipant since 1/1/78	Total
Sex				
Female	7	49	50	50
Male	7	51	50	50
Total percent		100	100	100
Race				
Black	19	35	12	14
Hispanic	13	11	6	6
White	5	54	82	80
Total percent		100	100	100
Age				
15	6	12	14	14
16-17	9	35	28	29
18-19	8	33	28	28
20-21	5	20	30	29
Total percent		100	100	100
Enrollment status				
High school dropout	10	17	12	12
High school student	8	46	42	42
College student	5	13	19	19
Nonenrolled high school graduate	7	24	27	27
Total percent		100	100	100
Region				
Northeast	7	21	21	21
North central	7	28	31	31
South	7	32	32	32
West	9	19	16	16
Total percent		100	100	100
Number of programs ever				
None	0	0	93	86
One	49	63	5	9
More than one	53	37	2	5
Total percent		100	100	100
Poverty				
CETA disadvantaged	16	47	20	22
CETA nondisadvantaged	5	53	80	78
Total percent		100	100	100
Below poverty as defined by CPS	17	33	13	15
Above poverty as defined by CPS	6	67	87	85
Total percent		100	100	100
Percent of sample		7	93	100

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-21 on January 1, 1979 (N=28,800,000).

than one program, while this proportion rose to almost one half in 1980. This increase may reflect the continuing expansion of government employment programs for youth. To a large extent, however, the shift is a result of the longitudinal methodology.[3] We do not know how much of the increase in participants in multiple programs can be attributed to actual changes in the service delivery rates of employment programs and how much is attributable to measurement effects.

Overall participation rates apparently declined, but most of the difference in participation rate can probably be attributed to the differences in length of time considered,[4] rather than to a true decline in participation.

PROGRAM SERVICES

It was possible for any individual to have participated in more than one program, each program providing different services. Respondents described every program they had participated in separately. The remainder of this chapter will treat each program as a separate case.[5]

Because school enrollment status was a major predictor of program use in the 1979 study, it is used as the primary participant characteristic in the descriptions of the 1980 programs. Labor market decisions made by high school students are substantially different from those facing youths who have completed their educations. Students can use school-provided training to gain the specific skills needed for employment in selected fields. Government employment and training programs may augment school services by providing work experience, valuable for development of general work habits and for exploration of future career options. Summer youth programs are designed to provide income for needy youth as well as to give them the benefits of work experience. During the school year, government training programs can provide part-time work for experience and income, and in addition, counseling and informational services aimed at helping youth successfully enter the labor market when they finish their education.

---

[3] The first interview of the NLS panel obtained retrospective data on participation in government programs at any time by participants. Since recent events are more likely to be recalled than are events which occurred further in the past, there should be more underreporting in the 1979 interview than on the interview in 1980, which only covered the interval between surveys.

[4] The data from 1979 cover the period between January 1, 1978 up until the interview date, a period averaging 15 months, while the 1980 interview covered the time between interviews, a period averaging about 12 months.

[5] The programs reported in each interview actually occurred in the previous year. By and large, the 1979 interview programs took place in 1978, and the 1980 interview programs took place in 1979. To avoid confusion, I will reference programs by the date of the interview on which they were described, rather than by the calendar date of the programs themselves.

Those who have completed school, however, need immediate job choice, training, and steady employment. Disadvantaged out-of-school youth who want additional training can use government programs as an alternative to the regular school system.

In 1980 school enrollment was again a major correlate of the distribution of services, the motivation for entering government programs, and participant evaluation of the quality of the programs (Table 4.2).[6] By far the most common types of service were subsidized employment[7] and job counseling. Job counseling is more likely to go to youths who have left school; for them permanent job selection is a more immediate problem than for students, who have higher rates of subsidized employment.[8] Placements into regular unsubsidized jobs were reported by only nine percent of the total sample, and these were concentrated among high school dropouts and high school enrollees.[9]

---

[6] Note that each program could provide any combination of available services. The glossary at the end of this chapter gives more complete descriptions of the services listed in the tables.

[7] Subsidized employment includes all types of jobs that program participants could have held, excluding Targeted Jobs Tax Credit positions. The three major categories of subsidized employment are: a) public service employment, where program funds are used to fully support a job slot in either government or a private, non-profit organization, b) work experience, which involves short-term placements in not-for-profit settings and aims to develop general job-holding skills or to help the client explore possible careers, and c) on-the-job training, which subsidizes up to half of the wages of a client in a

Five types of educational services were distinguished; all except college preparation were much more likely to be reported by participants who were out of school. Overall, the most frequent type of classroom training was for skills required in specific occupations; almost a third of all participants, and over two-fifths of out-of-school youth, were in such programs. Additionally, almost half of the high school dropouts reported getting training toward a high school equivalency degree, as did about a sixth of the nonenrolled high school graduates; at least some of these participants successfully completed the equivalency training. Proportions of the out-of-school participants similar to those for GED training reported getting some sort of basic education.

---

for-profit organization, with the understanding that the employer will hire someone below the usual qualifications for the position and that the subsidy compensates for the additional costs of bringing the employee up to the usual standards of those entering the job.

[8] The high proportion of high school students receiving subsidized employment is due in part to the survey instrument. It was decided to skip programs not involving subsidized employment for such students, in order to save time on an interview and in light of the focus on work experience placements for in-school youth. Earlier analysis indicated that this exclusion resulted in little or no change in results.

[9] Nine percent may be an underestimate of the amount of employment linked to program participation, since the question asks only about placement as part of program services. If, for instance, a participant receives counseling on job search techniques and lands a job using those techniques, the individual would not see this job as a program placement, despite a fairly direct link between program participation and getting the job.

Table 4.2A Proportion of Participants Receiving Various Services, by Enrollment Status, 1980

Services provided	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	Total
Job counseling	63	49	45	58	53
Basic education	44	16	7	25	22
English language	5	3	2	1	3
GED	45	13	3	17	18
College preparatory	16	14	21	17	16
Skills training	43	23	23	45	31
Subsidized job	79	100	90	85	92
Non-CETA job placement	4	10	3	14	9
Medical	27	11	11	15	15
Child care	9	4	4	8	6
Transportation	32	12	16	20	18
Lodging	13	2	7	9	6
Meals	27	15	9	18	17
Other	12	7	1	11	6
Total	17	50	12	21	100

UNIVERSE: Enrollment of civilians age 15-21 on January 1, 1980, in employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 (N=1,948,900).

Table 4.2B Proportion of Participants Receiving Various Services, by Enrollment Status in 1979

Services provided	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	Total
Job counseling	55	46	37	56	49
Basic education	30	13	11	28	19
English language	5	3	0	2	3
GED	34	8	5	13	13
College preparatory	15	15	17	12	15
Skills training	34	20	28	36	27
Subsidized job	88	100	95	88	94
Non-CETA job placement	10	6	7	16	9
Medical	24	11	14	21	16
Child care	6	4	4	3	4
Transportation	27	15	8	11	15
Total	16	46	12	26	100

UNIVERSE: Enrollment of civilians age 15-21 on January 1, 1979, in employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 (N=2,409,800).

Table 4.2 also shows the distributions of various types of support services like transportation, meals, and medical care, which do not directly affect job performance but that make it possible for the individual to work or participate in training.[10] Most of these services are much more likely to be reported by dropouts than by any other enrollment group, while college students tend to receive the fewest support services.

The 1979 and 1980 patterns are substantially similar, with evidence of a shift away from placement activities into training services. High school dropouts, in particular, were more likely in 1980 to say that they had received job counseling, basic education, preparation for a GED, or skills training than they were in 1979. There was also a modest increase in the proportion of programs that provided day care and transportation.

ATTITUDES TOWARD PROGRAMS

Participants were asked their attitudes and subjective evaluations of the programs (Table 4.3). By and large, participants rated the programs favorably. Most of the respondents felt that the work was easy and that discipline was easy or at least not too tough, and they were satisfied with their experiences in the programs. When asked how the program affected their chances of getting a good job, three quarters felt that their chances had improved. In somewhat fewer than half the programs, respondents indicated that they had been employed after their participation. More than half of the youths with such employment reported that the training they had received from

---

[10] The results of the 1979 interview warranted specifying two additional types of support services on subsequent interviews: lodging and meals. These are explicitly broken out in 1980 results shown in Table 4.2A, but are subsumed within the "other" category in Table 4.2B, the 1979 figures. The explicit probing for these two services no doubt increased reporting percentages.

Table 4.3 Weighted Distributions of Attitudes Toward Employment and Training Programs, 1979

1. How difficult or easy was the work you had to perform in this program?

Score	Category	1979 percent[a]	1980 percent[b]
1.	Very difficult	2	3
2.	Fairly difficult	15	14
3.	Not too difficult	31	31
4.	Fairly easy	29	27
5.	Very easy	23	25

2. And how about the discipline in the program--was it:

Score	Category	1979 percent[a]	1980 percent[b]
1.	Very tough	5	5
2.	Fairly tough	18	19
3.	Not too tough	33	30
4.	Fairly easy	23	24
5.	Very easy	21	22

3. Thinking back over your entire experience in this program, how satisfied or dissatisfied are you with it overall?

Score	Category	1979 percent[a]	1980 percent[b]
1.	Very satisfied	41	42
2.	Somewhat satisfied	46	46
3.	Somewhat dissatisfied	8	8
4.	Very dissatisfied	5	4

4. How did the training you received in this program affect your chances of getting a good job--do you feel your chances of getting a good job were improved or not improved?

Category	1979 percent[a]	1980 percent[b]
Improved	73	77
Not improved	27	23

5. After you left the program, did the training or experience you received help you or not help you in performing any job?[b]

Category	1979 percent[d]	1980 percent[c]
Helped	54	59
Not helped	46	41

[a] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 (N=2,414,900).

[b] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since last interview (N=2,013,600).

[c] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since last interview and who had been employed after leaving the program (N=852,600).

[d] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 and who had been employed after leaving the program (N=1,060,600).

the program had helped them on the job. If anything, the perceived effectiveness of the programs was reported to be slightly higher in 1980 than in 1979, but the differences between years are fairly small.

High school students were most likely to rate the programs as satisfactory and effective (Table 4.4). College students tended to be least favorably disposed to their program experiences. Of those who found jobs after leaving training programs, nonstudents were most likely to feel that skills learned in the program were useful on the job.

An apparent interaction between school enrollment status and perception of the programs over time suggests that students are less positively disposed toward their programs in 1980 than they were in 1979. On the other hand, high school graduates and dropouts had substantially more positive attitudes in 1980.[11]

While there is little difference by ethnicity in overall satisfaction with the programs, minority youth continued to have a more favorable view of the effectiveness of their programs in improving their chances of getting good jobs and their on-the-job performance. The result for the job performance item is particularly dramatic: although the percent of whites saying that government employment programs had improved their job performance stayed virtually constant, the percent of both blacks and Hispanics reporting improvement increased from 57 percent to 71 percent.[12]

---

[11] The positive shifts were smallest for satisfaction and largest for the belief that the training had helped on a subsequent job. This latter result must be assessed with caution, as it represents a relatively small number of cases, only those who had found paid employment following a training program, and estimates involve a greater amount of error than do estimates for larger samples. Of the three measures of perceived program effectiveness, however, this item is the most stringent, since it reports actual job performance rather than hypothetical benefits.

[12] There are some intriguing patterns in the comparison of the perceived

Table 4.4A Perceived Satisfaction and Effectiveness of Government Employment and Training, by Selected Characteristics, 1980

Characteristic	Percent satisfied[a]	Percent believe job chances improved[a]	Percent of universe[a]	Percent believe helped job performance[b]	Percent of universe[b]
Type of program					
Summer, not enrolled	84	72	7	69	11
Summer, enrolled	88	75	28	46	27
Year-round, not enrolled	85	80	31	66	33
Year-round, enrolled	91	79	34	60	29
Enrollment status					
High school dropout	83	78	17	64	17
High school student	91	80	49	53	36
College student	85	68	13	45	21
High school graduate	87	79	21	69	26
Ethnicity					
Black	88	81	36	71	32
Hispanic	89	77	12	71	10
White	88	76	52	51	58
Sex					
Female	90	79	50	57	45
Male	86	76	50	61	55

[a] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since last interview (N=1,942,300).

[b] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since last interview and who had been employed after leaving the program (N=822,800).

Table 4.4B Perceived Satisfaction and Effectiveness of Government Employment and Training, by Selected Characteristics, 1979

Characteristic	Percent satisfied[a]	Percent believe job chances improved[a]	Percent of universe[a]	Percent believe helped job performance[b]	Percent of universe[b]
Type of program					
Summer, not enrolled	82	53	5	36	9
Summer, enrolled	91	69	26	51	22
Year-round, not enrolled	83	73	37	57	44
Year-round, enrolled	88	79	32	59	25
Enrollment status					
High school dropout	78	71	16	43	21
High school student	89	75	46	57	32
College student	93	75	12	51	14
High school graduate	86	71	26	60	33
Ethnicity					
Black	86	75	35	57	30
Hispanic	84	71	11	57	10
White	88	72	54	52	60
Sex					
Female	87	74	49	61	44
Male	87	72	51	49	56

[a] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 (N=2,410,400).

[b] UNIVERSE: Enrollments of civilians age 15-21 who had participated in government employment and training programs since January 1, 1978 and who had been employed after leaving the program (N=1,060,600).

SUMMARY

Government sponsored employment and training programs continue to be dominated by subsidized employment, but there is an increased emphasis on classroom training, particularly among high school dropouts. In view of the fairly large change in program mix, the fact that the characteristics of the client population have remained virtually unchanged is noteworthy. Apparently changes in programs are not made in response to changes in clientele, but instead they reflect policy shifts toward training and away from subsidized employment. The small change in participation rates in favor of high school students probably does not account for differences in services because students are the group most likely to be in subsidized employment.

The new program added to the data base in 1980, Targeted Jobs Tax Credits, like other programs involving employment rather than training for employment, tended to go to members of less disadvantaged groups than did government programs as a whole. Even this program, however, showed much higher participation rates among the poor and ethnic minorities than among the nonpoor and whites.

The profiles of program participants and of the services and perceived effectiveness of programs did not change much from 1979 to 1980, in the absence of major legislative changes. It is tempting to attribute the increases in the favorable reactions to programs by out of school and minority youth to the change in service mix. The increased focus on skills training

---

effectiveness of the programs by sex. For satisfaction and chances of getting a good job, the tables show the usual small increase in favorable ratings overall. Among the young men in the sample, there is a fairly dramatic rise in percent who agree that the programs helped in a subsequent job. For young women, on the other hand, there is a small, four percent drop on this item. The reasons for these shifts cannot be determined from the current analysis.

rather than on subsidized job placement is consistent with the use of employment and training programs as a supplement to the regular school system for youths who did not obtain sufficient skills to become employable their first time around. Whatever the reasons, youths are by and large quite satisfied with their experiences in employment programs and believe that the programs are filling their stated goals of improving employment opportunities.

Chapter 4 Glossary

AFDC
Aid to Families with Dependent Children.

CETA
The Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. CETA funded agencies provide a variety of employability services.

CPS
Current Population Survey.

ENROLLMENT STATUS
Enrollment status as of May 1, 1979, for 1979 interview, or May 1, 1980, for 1980 interview. Includes college enrollment.
Categories include:
(1) high school dropout
(2) high school student
(3) college student
(4) nonenrolled high school graduate

NUMBER OF PROGRAMS EVER
The number of government sponsored training programs that respondent participated in.
(1) none
(2) one
(3) more than one

OMB
Office of Management and Budget.

PROGRAM SERVICES
Kinds of services and other types of training provided for the respondent by various programs. The respondent could have had multiple services from one training program. Services include:

BASIC EDUCATION
A binary variable coded 1 if the training program provided classroom training in reading, writing, or mathematics.

COLLEGE PREPARATORY
A binary variable coded 1 if the program provided classroom training to prepare the participant for college enrollment.

GED
A binary variable coded 1 if the program provided classroom training aimed at completion of a high school equivalency degree.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE
A binary variable coded 1 if the program provided, as part of a basic education program, English language training.

JOB COUNSELING
A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent reported receiving any sort of job counseling.

NON-CETA JOB PLACEMENT
A binary variable coded 1 if the program placed the respondent on a job outside the program. CETA jobs were excluded to get an estimate of the frequency of unsubsidized placements.

SUBSIDIZED JOB
A binary variable coded 1 if the respondent was placed on a government subsidized job after completion of the training program. Major types of subsidized jobs include Public Service Employment, work experience, and on-the-job training.

SUPPORTIVE SERVICES
A sequence of binary variables coded 1 if the program provided the service. Supportive services explicitly probed on the interviews included:

- MEDICAL CARE
- CHILD CARE
- TRANSPORTATION
- LODGING (1980 only)
- MEALS (1980 only)

Chapter 4 References

Crowley, J. E. 1981. Government sponsored employment and training. In *Pathways to the future: Report on the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth Labor Market Experience in 1979*. ed. M Borus, pp 369-460. Columbus, Ohio: The Ohio State University Center for Human Resource Research.

U. S. Department of Labor. 1979. Comprehensive Employment and Training Act Regulations; Final Rule. *Federal Register*. Tuesday, April 3, 1979. Part IX.

U. S. Department of Labor. 1980. *Employment and training report of the president*. Washington, D. C.

Chapter 5
Education and the Schools Youth Attend

by Michael E. Borus

SCHOOL CHARACTERISTICS

During 1980 the NLS gathered information on the schools attended by the members of the youth cohort and on some of the educational services they received in school (Tables 5.1 to 5.4).[1]

The national average student-teacher ratio was 19.3 students per teacher (Table 5.1). The student-teacher ratio was higher than average in the West and lower in the Northeast. Those students who drop out of school tend to have been in schools with slightly higher student-teacher ratios[2], as do those whose family income in 1979 was below the poverty line. The student-teacher ratios for minorities were higher than for whites; the average for whites was 19, for blacks 20, and for Hispanics 21. Thus it would appear that minorities and the poor receive fewer educational resources in terms of teacher time than do those students who may need the services less.

The evidence on student-counselor ratios points to the same conclusion (Table 5.1). The national average was 356 students per counselor. However, the average was 387 for blacks and 390 for Hispanics, but only 350 for whites. Those whose family incomes in 1979 fell below the poverty line had an average student-counselor ratio of 382, as opposed to 352 for those above the poverty line. The ratio is also higher for those whose parents had less

---

[1] The school data refer to that school attended by the youth in the spring of 1980 if they were still enrolled and the last school attended if no longer enrolled. The data were provided by the schools, which were contacted directly.

[2] Since student-teacher ratios decline with level of schooling, these higher ratios may reflect the fact that some of the dropouts left school before reaching senior high school.

Table 5.1 Mean Student-Teacher and Student-Counselor Ratios, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Student-teacher ratio	Student-counselor ratio
AGE		
15	19.1	366
16-17	19.3	353
18-19	19.3	360
20-21	19.2	352
22-23	19.3	359
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT		
0-8 years	19.6	370
9-11 years	19.3	359
12 years	19.2	355
13-15 years	19.1	350
16+ years	19.4	367
ENROLLMENT STATUS		
High school dropout	20.3	372
High school student	19.1	356
College student	19.1	346
High school graduate	19.2	358
REGION		
Northeast	17.5	333
North Central	18.8	327
South	19.8	414
West	21.3	329
HEALTH		
Good	19.3	356
Poor	19.5	368
MARITAL STATUS		
Never married	19.3	355
Married spouse present	19.1	363
Other	21.7	411
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN		
Female with children	20.0	369
Female without children	19.3	358
Male with children	18.2	353
Male without children	19.1	353

Table 5.1 continued

Characteristic	Student-teacher ratio	Student-counselor ratio
EMPLOYMENT STATUS		
Employed	19.3	355
Unemployed	19.8	363
Not in labor force	18.9	352
INCOME		
$0 to $4,999	19.1	371
$5,000 to $9,999	19.2	373
$10,000 to $14,999	19.4	369
$15,000 to $19,999	19.3	366
$20,000 to $24,999	19.4	358
$25,000 to $29,999	19.1	342
$30,000 to $39,999	19.1	339
$40,000 or more	19.2	341
SEX AND RACE		
Black	20.1	387
Female	20.3	389
Male	19.8	384
Hispanic	21.0	390
Female	21.3	398
Male	20.7	382
White	19.0	350
Female	19.2	353
Male	18.9	389
POVERTY STATUS		
Above poverty	19.2	352
Below poverty	19.6	382
EXPECTED EDUCATION		
0-8 years	20.4	308
9-11 years	19.4	358
12 years	19.1	361
13-15 years	19.7	357
16+ years	19.2	352
PARENTAL EDUCATION		
0-8 years	19.2	373
9-11 years	19.4	367
12 years	19.2	353
13-15 years	19.4	342
16+ years	19.0	341
TOTAL	19.3	356

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

education and those who eventually became high school dropouts.

Almost all high schools offered vocational training in business, home economics and trade subjects; three-quarters offered distributive education courses; two-thirds offered technical training, six out of ten provided health education courses and approximately half offered training in agricultural subjects (See Table 5.2). There was very little difference by race and sex in the availability of vocational programs with the exceptions of agricultural courses, which were more available in high schools attended by Hispanics and less available in high schools attended by blacks, and distributive education, which was more available in schools attended by whites. As one would expect, agricultural courses were less prevalent in the Northeast than in other parts of the country. The availability of vocational programs did not vary with respect to other characteristics of the youth. Youth with lower socioeconomic backgrounds attended schools which provided the same access to vocational programs as did young people from more advantaged families.

An important feature of the schools attended by youth is the racial composition of students and faculty. Table 5.3 indicates the minority composition of the schools attended by black, Hispanic and white youth. The majority of black and Hispanic youth attend segregated schools, i.e., those where more than half of students are also minorities; 53 percent of the blacks and 50 percent of the Hispanics attended schools which were over half minorities. Schools attended by blacks averaged 58 percent minority students and those attended by Hispanics 53 percent, as compared with the average of 13 percent minorities in the schools attended by whites.

Segregation of blacks was highest in the Northeast and North Central states, where the black youth attended schools that averaged about two-thirds minorities. Hispanics in the Northeast states also attended schools which had

Table 5.2 Percent of Schools Offering Vocational Programs in Agriculture, Business, Distributive Education, Health, Home Economics, Trade and Technical, by Respondent's Characteristics

Characteristic	Agric.	Business	Dist. Educ.	Health	Home Econ.	Trade	Technical
SEX AND RACE							
Black	42	94	69	62	86	86	62
Female	42	95	69	61	86	85	63
Male	43	93	70	63	86	87	62
Hispanic	54	94	64	59	85	87	59
Female	53	95	65	58	84	86	59
Male	55	93	63	59	85	89	60
White	48	95	75	58	83	86	67
Female	49	96	75	59	84	86	67
Male	47	94	75	57	81	85	66
AGE							
15	43	83	53	49	76	77	50
16-17	47	94	74	60	84	86	65
18-19	48	97	78	61	84	88	69
20-21	47	96	75	58	84	85	67
22-23	50	95	75	58	83	85	66
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT							
0-8 years	73	71	39	41	70	70	40
9-11 years	49	95	74	59	85	86	65
12 years	50	97	77	61	86	89	70
13-15 years	42	96	73	55	79	83	65
16+ years	49	92	76	58	79	78	61
ENROLLMENT STATUS							
High school dropout	54	94	74	58	85	86	64
High school student	47	92	71	58	83	85	62
College student	42	96	76	59	81	85	68
High school graduate	50	97	76	59	85	87	68
REGION							
Northeast	29	92	68	59	74	81	67
North Central	44	96	76	60	84	86	66
South	60	95	80	58	86	86	63
West	53	95	63	56	88	89	69

Table 5.2 continued

Characteristic	Agric.	Business	Dist. Educ.	Health	Home Econ.	Trade	Technical
HEALTH							
Good	48	95	74	59	83	86	66
Poor	50	93	68	61	82	84	67
MARITAL STATUS							
Never married	46	94	74	58	83	85	65
Married spouse present	58	96	75	62	87	90	69
Other	56	97	79	65	89	88	62
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN							
Female with children	55	97	73	60	86	87	66
Female without children	47	96	74	59	82	86	66
Male with children	60	95	78	66	89	95	74
Male without children	46	94	74	58	84	85	65
EMPLOYMENT STATUS							
Employed	48	96	76	59	84	87	68
Unemployed	47	95	78	63	85	88	68
Not in labor force	47	95	74	59	83	85	66
INCOME							
$0 - $4,999	46	95	72	54	83	86	65
$5,000 - $9,999	56	94	73	62	86	86	67
$10,000 - $14,999	54	94	72	58	85	88	60
$15,000 - $19,999	56	96	76	60	89	90	69
$20,000 - $24,999	50	94	73	58	82	85	65
$25,000 - $29,999	47	96	74	55	81	80	60
$30,000 - $39,999	39	95	76	59	81	85	67
$40,000 or more	39	94	78	56	79	84	69
POVERTY STATUS							
Above poverty	48	95	74	58	83	86	66
Below poverty	48	94	71	58	86	85	63

Table 5.2 continued

Characteristic	Agric.	Business	Dist. Educ.	Health	Home Econ.	Trade	Technical
EXPECTED EDUCATION							
0-8 years	42	67	45	35	51	60	44
9-11 years	57	94	72	58	87	85	63
12 years	52	95	73	61	86	88	68
13-15 years	50	96	74	60	85	88	65
16+ years	42	94	75	57	80	83	65
PARENTAL EDUCATION							
0-8 years	57	95	69	58	88	88	66
9-11 years	50	94	73	63	86	88	66
12 years	50	96	76	60	84	86	66
13-15 years	41	95	75	57	82	84	66
16+ years	40	93	75	56	76	80	65
TOTAL	48	95	74	59	83	86	66

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979.
(N = 32,740,000)

Table 5.3 Mean Percent Minority Students in School, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
AGE				
15	62	56	12	20
16-17	57	52	13	20
18-19	57	53	13	20
20-21	59	54	12	19
22-23	58	50	13	20
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
0-8 years	61	70	17	30
9-11 years	58	52	13	21
12 years	57	50	12	18
13-15 years	59	51	13	19
16+ years	49	29	15	17
ENROLLMENT STATUS				
High school dropout	57	61	15	26
High school student	59	52	12	20
College student	58	50	14	19
High school graduate	57	50	12	18
REGION				
Northeast	63	64	9	16
North Central	69	24	8	12
South	53	55	19	28
West	55	51	18	25
HEALTH				
Good	58	52	13	20
Poor	53	56	12	19
MARITAL STATUS				
Never married	58	52	13	20
Married spouse present	54	53	14	18
Other	65	59	15	26
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN				
Female with children	62	58	15	29
Female without children	58	52	13	19
Male with children	50	63	12	18
Male without children	57	51	12	19
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Employed	56	49	13	18
Unemployed	56	56	14	24
Not in labor force	61	56	12	21

Table 5.3 continued

Characteristic	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
INCOME				
$0 - $4,999	57	69	17	30
$5,000 - $9,999	60	61	12	25
$10,000 - $14,999	58	51	13	23
$15,000 - $19,999	56	57	13	20
$20,000 - $24,999	56	45	12	17
$25,000 - $29,999	59	43	11	15
$30,000 - $39,999	52	34	13	16
$40,000 or more	53	39	12	15
SEX				
Females	59	53	13	20
Males	57	52	12	19
POVERTY STATUS				
Above poverty	58	48	12	18
Below poverty	59	64	15	35
EXPECTED EDUCATION				
0-8 years	52	72	15	20
9-11 years	50	60	15	23
12 years	57	56	12	19
13-15 years	56	50	13	20
16+ years	61	48	13	20
PARENTAL EDUCATION				
0-8 years	54	60	14	28
9-11 years	62	57	12	23
12 years	60	44	12	17
13-15 years	54	43	13	17
16+ years	45	28	12	14
TOTAL	58	53	13	20

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

about two-thirds minorities; in the North Central states, however, Hispanics attended schools which had a much lower minority composition. Nationally, poor Hispanics tended to be in schools with heavier minority populations than were their counterparts whose family incomes in 1979 were above the poverty line. Hispanics with backgrounds that indicated lower socioeconomic status, i.e., those whose parents had lower levels of formal education and who expected to have less education themselves, were also more concentrated in segregated schools.

As one might expect, black students attended schools which had higher percentages of faculty who were minorities (See Table 5.4).[3] Black students were in schools where approximately one-third of the faculty were minorities. The corresponding figure for Hispanics was one-fifth but whites attended schools where only one-twentieth of the faculty were minority persons. Students of all races in the Southern states and black students in the North Central states had more minority faculty than their counterparts elsewhere. There did not seem to be any other characteristics associated with higher percentages of minority faculty.

RECEIPT OF REMEDIAL EDUCATION

Another aspect of the educational process is the receipt of special remedial services. These services include remedial English, remedial mathematics, bilingual education, and English as a second language. Table 5.5 indicates that remedial English was available to 93 percent of the youth and that 13 percent of the youth received such special programs at some point in their elementary or high school education. As would be expected, those who had

---

[3] Minority faculty includes blacks, Hispanics, Native Americans and Asians and Pacific Islanders.

Table 5.4 Mean Percent Minority Faculty in School, by Selected Characteristics

Characteristic	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
AGE				
15	39	23	5	10
16-17	37	19	5	9
18-19	32	18	6	10
20-21	35	20	5	9
22-23	34	15	6	10
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
0-8 years	46	25	8	16
9-11 years	33	18	5	10
12 years	33	18	5	9
13-15 years	33	20	5	8
16+ years	24	8	6	7
ENROLLMENT STATUS				
High school dropout	34	19	7	13
High school student	35	19	5	10
College student	32	20	5	8
High school graduate	34	17	5	9
REGION				
Northeast	20	16	2	4
North Central	35	13	2	5
South	38	28	11	18
West	21	15	6	8
HEALTH				
Good	34	19	5	9
Poor	30	18	5	8
MARITAL STATUS				
Never married	34	19	5	9
Married spouse present	30	19	6	8
Other	40	25	8	14
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN				
Female with children	37	23	8	16
Female without children	33	19	5	9
Male with children	23	16	6	8
Male without children	34	18	5	9
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Employed	32	17	5	8
Unemployed	31	19	6	12
Not in labor force	36	21	5	11

Table 5.4 continued

Characteristic	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
INCOME				
$0 - $4,999	36	26	8	16
$5,000 - $9,999	36	22	5	12
$10,000 - $14,999	32	20	6	11
$15,000 - $19,999	34	21	6	9
$20,000 - $24,999	31	18	5	8
$25,000 - $29,999	33	13	4	7
$30,000 - $39,999	28	13	5	6
$40,000 or more	33	18	5	6
SEX				
Female	34	19	6	10
Male	34	18	5	9
POVERTY STATUS				
Above poverty	32	18	5	8
Below poverty	37	22	7	19
EXPECTED EDUCATION				
0-8 years	36	28	10	12
9-11 years	31	20	7	11
12 years	35	19	5	10
13-15 years	32	18	6	9
16+ years	34	19	5	9
PARENTAL EDUCATION				
0-8 years	35	21	7	14
9-11 years	38	22	6	12
12 years	33	16	5	8
13-15 years	28	17	5	7
16+ years	24	13	5	6
Total	34	19	5	9

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

Table 5.5 Participation in Remedial English and Mathematics, by Selected Characteristics

(Percent distribution)

Characteristic	Participated in remedial English	Remedial English not offered	Participated in remedial mathematics	Remedial mathematics not offered
AGE				
15	16	7	12	8
16-17	15	6	14	6
18-19	14	7	12	8
20-21	9	6	9	7
22-23	8	9	7	9
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
0-8 years	39	11	34	12
9-11 years	16	6	14	7
12 years	11	8	9	9
13-15 years	3	5	2	6
16+ years	3	6	2	6
ENROLLMENT STATUS				
High school dropout	29	8	24	9
High school student	16	6	13	7
College student	4	4	2	5
High school graduate	10	9	9	9
REGION				
Northeast	10	8	8	8
North Central	11	7	9	8
South	14	7	12	8
West	16	4	15	3
HEALTH				
Good	13	7	10	7
Poor	16	9	16	9
MARITAL STATUS				
Never married	13	6	11	7
Married spouse present	9	10	8	10
Other	a	a	a	a
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN				
Female with children	12	9	12	9
Female without children	8	6	7	7
Male with children	16	9	14	9
Male without children	17	7	14	8

Table 5.5 continued

Characteristic	Participated in remedial English	Remedial English not offered	Participated in remedial mathematics	Remedial mathematics not offered
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Employed	11	5	10	6
Unemployed	20	9	17	9
Not in labor force	14	7	13	8
INCOME				
$0 - $4,999	19	9	16	9
$5,000 - $9,999	16	9	14	10
$10,000 - $14,999	13	8	12	11
$15,000 - $19,999	12	10	10	11
$20,000 - $24,999	13	7	10	8
$25,000 - $29,999	10	7	10	6
$30,000 - $39,999	10	4	8	4
$40,000 or more	7	4	5	5
SEX AND RACE				
Black	27	8	25	10
Female	23	7	20	10
Male	32	9	30	11
Hispanic	28	3	24	3
Female	22	4	21	4
Male	33	3	26	3
White	10	7	8	7
Female	6	7	5	7
Male	14	7	11	8
POVERTY STATUS				
Above poverty	11	6	9	7
Below poverty	25	10	22	10
EXPECTED EDUCATION				
0-8 years	30	10	20	15
9-11 years	30	8	26	9
12 years	20	8	17	9
13-15 years	10	8	10	8
16+ years	5	5	4	6

Table 5.5 continued

Characteristic	Participated in remedial English	Remedial English not offered	Participated in remedial mathematics	Remedial mathematics not offered
PARENTAL EDUCATION				
0-8 years	21	9	17	11
9-11 years	18	9	15	10
12 years	10	7	9	8
13-15 years	9	4	7	4
16+ years	5	4	4	4
Total	13	7	11	8

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 32,740,000)

[a] Insufficient sample size

dropped out of school prior to completing the twelfth grade were more than twice as likely as other students to have received remedial English courses. Receipt of these services also was somewhat more prevalent in the West and South than in the Northeast and North Central states.

Minority students, particularly males, were more likely to receive remedial English. Approximately one-third of black and Hispanic males, as compared to 14 percent of white males, received such educational services. The proportion of women receiving the services is below that of males for all three racial/ethnic groups and fewer racial differentials exist among women.

Receipt of remedial English was also related to socioeconomic background. It declined considerably as parental education increased and was more than twice as high for those youth who were from families with poverty incomes in 1979 as compared with those who were not. Finally, as one would expect, participation in remedial English declined as the level of educational attainment and the expected education of the students increased, i.e., those individuals who were doing better in school and who expected to go on to college or had done so, were less likely to need and receive remedial English.

Similar patterns are found for participation in remedial mathematics programs. One in four minorities received such courses as compared with one in twelve whites. Two and one-half times as many with 1979 family incomes below the poverty line as above it had received remedial mathematics courses, and participation in such programs was much higher for those whose parents' education was less than high school than for those whose parents had completed college. Similarly, high school dropouts had a much higher rate of participation (24 percent) than the total population (11 percent). Finally, participation declined with educational attainment and the level of education the youth expected to complete.

Bilingual education was available to 70 percent of the youth although only 3 percent actually participated in such a program. English as a second language was available to 72 percent of the students but only 1 percent actually participated. As would be expected, participation rates in these two programs was much higher for Hispanics than for blacks or whites. Ten percent of Hispanics, two percent of blacks, and three percent of whites participated in bilingual education and seven percent of Hispanics, one percent of blacks and less than one percent of whites participated in English as a second language. Therefore, it seemed most appropriate to examine participation in these two programs separately for Hispanics (Table 5.6).

Bilingual education for Hispanics appears most prevalent in the Northeast and North Central states. Participation among those students whose family income was below the poverty line in 1979 and those students whose parents had completed only elementary school was approximately double the rates for students from nonpoverty families and those whose parents had completed some high school. Training in English as a second language was much more prevalent in the Northeast states among those with 1979 family incomes below the poverty line, those whose parental education was low, and those whose educational attainment was less than high school graduation.

Receipt of remedial educational services appears more concentrated among minorities, persons from low socioeconomic backgrounds, and the poor. Whether this represents an accurate response to the need for services or inappropriate educational tracking cannot be determined from our present data set.

ENROLLMENT STATUS IN 1980

The aging of the cohort changed the enrollment status of the youth in 1980 from 1979, although the enrollment status of youth 15-21 was similar to

Table 5.6 Hispanic Participation in Bilingual Education and English as a Second Language, by Selected Characteristics

(Percent distribution)

Characteristic	Participated in bilingual education	Bilingual education not offered	Participated in English as a second language	English as a second language not offered
AGE				
15	7	10	5	12
16-17	10	17	8	15
18-19	12	23	9	19
20-21	7	23	5	23
22-23	11	30	7	24
EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT				
0-8 years	15	20	16	20
9-11 years	10	20	8	18
12 years	7	23	5	18
13-15 years	9	19	2	19
16+ years	a	a	a	a
ENROLLMENT STATUS				
High school dropout	9	26	9	21
High school student	11	18	9	17
College student	13	17	4	18
High school graduate	6	24	4	19
REGION				
Northeast	13	18	14	14
North Central	17	26	4	25
South	7	23	4	29
West	9	20	7	12
HEALTH				
Good	9	21	7	18
Poor	16	17	9	12
MARITAL STATUS				
Never married	10	20	7	18
Married spouse present	4	28	6	23
Other	a	a	a	a
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN				
Female with children	7	28	9	23
Female without children	12	19	7	17
Male with children	5	38	5	30
Male without children	9	20	7	18

Table 5.6 continued

Characteristic	Participated in bilingual education	Bilingual education not offered	Participated in English as a second language	English as a second language not offered
EMPLOYMENT STATUS				
Employed	9	20	4	18
Unemployed	10	20	8	13
Not in labor force	12	23	12	22
INCOME				
\$0 - \$4,999	16	15	13	20
\$5,000 - \$9,999	15	21	11	21
\$10,000 - \$14,999	12	23	9	20
\$15,000 - \$19,999	8	21	4	18
\$20,000 - \$24,999	4	15	5	12
\$25,000 - \$29,999	2	19	2	18
\$30,000 - \$39,999	4	27	2	23
\$40,000 or more	10	25	2	24
SEX				
Female	11	20	7	18
Male	9	21	7	19
POVERTY STATUS				
Above poverty	7	21	5	18
Below poverty	16	19	14	20
EXPECTED EDUCATION				
0-8 years	a	a	a	a
9-11 years	10	30	12	27
12 years	8	23	5	22
13-15 years	8	17	9	13
16+ years	12	18	8	15
PARENTAL EDUCATION				
0-8 years	15	20	11	20
9-11 years	4	20	2	15
12 years	6	26	3	19
13-15 years	3	16	3	14
16+ years	5	16	3	21
Total	10	21	7	18

UNIVERSE: Hispanic civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. (N = 4,460,000)

[a]Insufficient sample size

that reported for 1979. A smaller proportion were enrolled in high school, 37 percent as opposed to 49 percent. Thirty-two percent were now high school graduates not enrolled in college, as opposed to 24 percent in the preceding year. The proportion who were high school dropouts increased from 11 to 12 percent and the proportion who were enrolled in college increased from 16 to 18 percent. As in the preceding year, approximately one in four Hispanics had dropped out of high school and one in six black youth had done so as compared with one in ten whites. Having a family income below the poverty line in 1979 was associated with higher dropout rates and lower enrollment in college. Likewise, parental educational attainment was negatively correlated with dropping out of high school and positively correlated with enrollment in college. The scores on the knowledge of the world of work scale were considerably lower for dropouts (see Table 5.7).

Among youth age 20-21 we find that 31 percent of Hispanics had left high school without completing it, as did 24 percent of blacks. The rate for whites was only 12 percent. Among high school graduates, however, enrollment in college does not vary markedly by race and sex, although the rate for Hispanics is slightly lower than those for whites and blacks. Poverty status based on 1979 family income does not appear to influence enrollment in college of high school graduates.

SCHOOLING DECISIONS

Four important schooling decisions which occurred between 1979 and 1980 were examined: dropping out of school, returning to high school, completing the twelfth grade and going on to college.

Dropping Out of School. Six percent of youth who were students in 1979 left school during the following year without graduating. These represent over one

Table 5.7 Enrollment Status by Selected Characteristics: 1980

	Enrolled		Not Enrolled		Total	
Characteristic	Below college	In college	High school graduate	Not high school graduate	Percent	Number (thousands)
RACE AND SEX						
Black	42	14	28	17	100	4,462
Female	39	17	30	14	100	2,298
Male	44	11	25	19	100	2,164
Hispanic	39	12	25	25	100	2,073
Female	37	12	27	25	100	1,042
Male	41	12	22	25	100	1,032
White	36	19	34	11	100	26,200
Female	35	19	36	10	100	13,069
Male	38	19	32	11	100	13,132
AGE						
15	98	0	0	2	100	3,152
16-17	88	0	1	10	100	8,393
18-19	20	30	34	16	100	8,095
20-21	0	30	55	14	100	8,200
22-23	0	21	64	14	100	4,896
POVERTY STATUS						
Above poverty	39	19	33	9	100	27,958
Below poverty	36	14	24	26	100	4,752
PARENTAL EDUCATION						
0-8 years	33	10	32	25	100	6,310
9-11 years	38	8	35	19	100	5,617
12 years	39	16	38	7	100	11,404
13-15 years	40	26	31	4	100	3,640
16+ years	37	40	22	2	100	5,739
EXPECTED EDUCATION						
0-8 years	3	0	2	94	100	376
9-11 years	16	1	9	74	100	1,556
12 years	42	1	40	17	100	12,190
13-15 years	31	13	51	4	100	5,663
16+ years	40	39	20	2	100	12,925
CURRICULUM						
Vocational	33	9	48	10	100	5,143
College preparatory	39	35	24	2	100	10,644
General	39	11	34	16	100	16,922

Table 5.7 continued

	Enrolled		Not Enrolled		Total	
Characteristic	Below college	In college	High school graduate	Not high school graduate	Percent	Number (thousands)
PLACE OF RESIDENCE						
Rural	40	13	32	14	100	6,967
Non-rural	37	20	32	12	100	25,743
REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION						
Received remedial instruction	44	9	29	19	100	5,570
Did not receive remedial instruction	37	22	34	8	100	27,140
Mean % minority students in school	20	19	18	26	20	32,736
Mean student-teacher ratio	19	19	19	20	19	32,736
Mean score on knowledge of the world of work	5	7	7	5	6	32,736
LOCAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE						
0-3%	39	20	30	12	100	557
3-6%	37	18	32	13	100	15,862
6-9%	38	18	32	12	100	13,845
9-12%	37	17	37	9	100	1,935
12+%	37	11	37	15	100	521
REGION						
Northeast	37	22	32	9	100	6,726
North Central	39	16	35	10	100	9,861
South	37	18	30	16	100	10,748
West	35	18	34	14	100	5,375
TOTAL	37	18	32	12	100	32,736

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979.
(N = 32,740,000)

million youth. The proportion dropping out was considerably higher for Hispanics, among whom 12 percent of the males and 10 percent of the females dropped out of school between the 1979 survey and the 1980 survey. The dropout rate was more than three times higher (15 percent) for those whose 1979 family income was below the poverty line than for those whose 1979 income was above the line (4 percent). Dropping out also was much more prevalent among those whose parental education was less than high school graduation, those in general and vocational curricula, those two or more years behind grade level in 1979 and those dissatisfied with school (Table 5.8).

Returning to School. Some individuals who had dropped out of high school and had not received a GED returned to school during the period between the 1979 and 1980 surveys. Eight percent of the 3,560,000 persons who had dropped out of school when surveyed in 1979, or 280,000 persons, returned to school during the year. Cross-tabular presentation (Table 5.8) produced very little to explain who would go back to school. Younger dropouts were more likely to return to school, as were those whose parents' educational level was high, those who indicated high educational expectations in 1979, and those who had been enrolled in vocational programs.

High School Graduation. About 93 percent of all twelfth graders in 1979 graduated from high school in the following 12 months. In crosstabular analysis (Table 5.9) we find that blacks (84 percent) were less likely to graduate than Hispanics (90 percent) and whites (94 percent). Positive associations appeared between age and expected education in 1979 and high school graduation; negative relationships appeared for those whose family income in 1979 was below the poverty level, those who had been two or more years behind normal grade level, and those who had received remedial English or mathematics at some point in their high school careers. To the extent that

Table 5.8 High School Students Dropping out of and Returning to High School

Characteristic	Percent of high school students dropping out	Number of high school students dropping out (thousands)	Percent of dropouts returning to high school	Number of high school returning to high school (thousands)
RACE AND SEX				
Black	7	180	9	61
Female	6	78	11	34
Male	8	102	8	27
Hispanic	11	119	8	36
Female	10	49	7	16
Male	12	70	10	20
White	6	735	8	185
Female	6	347	8	98
Male	6	388	7	87
AGE				
15	1	36	--	--
16-17	7	580	21	83
18-19	7	357	10	113
20-21	18	56	5	59
22-23	--	--	2	18
POVERTY STATUS				
Above poverty	4	649	9	216
Below poverty	15	385	7	66
PARENTAL EDUCATION				
0-8 years	12	354	6	92
9-11 years	11	324	8	70
12 years	4	251	10	78
13-15 years	2	52	14	22
16+ years	2	52	23	19
EXPECTED EDUCATION				
0-8 years	59	18	1	2
9-11 years	41	190	3	34
12 years	9	637	9	151
13-15 years	3	85	24	60
16+ years	2	104	22	34

Table 5.8 continued

Characteristic	Percent of high school students dropping out	Number of high school students dropping out (thousands)	Percent of dropouts returning to high school	Number of dropouts returning to high school (thousands)
CURRICULUM				
Vocational	7	167	13	56
College preparatory	1	80	7	14
General	8	787	9	212
PLACE OF RESIDENCE				
Rural	7	267	7	62
Non-rural	6	767	8	218
YEARS BEHIND MODAL GRADE				
0-1	5	694	20	93
2 or more	21	340	6	189
REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION				
Received	9	346	9	108
Did not receive	5	687	7	174
Mean % minority students in school	26	1034	36	282
Mean student-teacher ratio	21	1034	22	282
Mean score on knowledge of the world of work	5	1034	5	282
LOCAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE				
0-3%	5	14	5	3
3-6%	6	504	8	149
6-9%	7	464	7	98
9-12%	4	41	16	27
12+%	4	11	8	6
GLOBAL SCHOOL SATISFACTION				
Satisfied	4	778	--	--
Not satisfied	10	256	--	--
Mean score on 10 point school satisfaction index	7	1034	--	--

Table 5.8 continued

Characteristic	Percent of high school students dropping out	Number of high school students dropping out (thousands)	Percent of dropouts returning to high school	Number of dropouts returning to high school (thousands)
REGION				
Northeast	4	145	11	61
North Central	5	262	6	49
South	8	437	4	67
West	7	190	16	107
Total	6	1034	8	282

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979. For dropping out, the universe is further restricted to those enrolled in high school on January 1, 1979. (N = 16,580,000)
For returning to high school, the universe is restricted to those who were dropouts at the time of the 1979 interview. (N = 3,560,000)

Table 5.9 Percent of Twelfth Graders in 1979 Who Graduated and Who Went on to College by 1980, by Demographic Characteristics

Characteristic	Percent of 12th graders who graduated	Percent of 12th graders who went on to college	Number of 12th graders at time of 1979 interview
RACE AND SEX			
Black	84	42	432
Female	87	46	229
Male	80	37	203
Hispanic	90	46	162
Female	92	42	73
Male	89	49	89
White	94	48	2,597
Female	96	52	1,269
Male	93	45	1,327
AGE			
15	a	a	a
16-17	49	20	718
18-19	94	50	2,929
20-21	84	16	186
22-23	a	a	a
POVERTY STATUS			
Above poverty	94	50	2,794
Below poverty	84	34	396
PARENTAL EDUCATION			
0-8 years	90	31	467
9-11 years	88	24	438
12 years	95	40	1,101
13-15 years	96	57	453
16+ years	95	82	731
EXPECTED EDUCATION			
0-8 years	a	a	a
9-11 years	a	a	a
12 years	89	8	1,105
13-15 years	91	37	599
16+ years	96	83	601
CURRICULUM			
Vocational	88	13	482
College preparatory	97	79	1,093
General	91	36	1,615

Table 5.9 continued

	Percent of 12th graders who graduated	Percent of 12th graders who went on to college	Number of 12th graders at time of 1979 interview
PLACE OF RESIDENCE			
Rural	94	36	628
Non-rural	92	51	2,329
YEARS BEHIND MODAL GRADE			
0-1	93	50	2,991
2 or more	84	14	166
REMEDIAL INSTRUCTION			
Received	81	24	525
Did not receive	95	52	2,665
Mean % minority students in school	19	20	3,190
Mean student-teacher ratio	19	19	3,190
Mean score on knowledge of the world of work	6	7	3,190
LOCAL UNEMPLOYMENT RATE			
0-3%	a	a	a
3-6%	92	47	1,627
6-9%	94	49	1,341
9-12%	91	40	158
12+%	a	a	a
GLOBAL SCHOOL SATISFACTION			
Satisfied	93	48	2,775
Not satisfied	91	42	415
REGION			
Northeast	93	51	734
North Central	94	43	949
South	93	54	963
West	89	38	419
Total	93	48	3,190

UNIVERSE: Civilian noninstitutional population age 14-21 on January 1, 1979 who were in the 12th grade in 1979. (N = 3,190,000)

[a] Insufficient sample size

these variables are correlated with race, e.g., earlier we found that blacks were much more likely to have received remedial instruction and to have below poverty level incomes, it appears that these factors rather than race are the major determinants of high school graduation.

College Enrollment. Finally, we examined the proportion of persons in the twelfth grade at the survey date in 1979 who went on to college in 1980 (Table 5.9). Almost half of the class of 1979, 48 percent, did enroll in college. The rate of enrollment was slightly higher for white and black females and Hispanic males than for their counterparts of the opposite sex. The rate of college attendance was approximately 50 percent higher for those whose 1979 family incomes were above the poverty line than for those with 1979 family incomes below that level. College attendance was higher in the Northeastern and Southern states than in the North Central and Western states. As expected, it increased with parental education.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Social science research has demonstrated repeatedly the importance of education for subsequent success in the labor market. In this chapter, the educational status and decisions of youth have been examined. From these data, several facts become clear.

1. The poor and those from lower socioeconomic backgrounds are disadvantaged in their schooling. These youth attend schools with higher student-teacher and student-counselor ratios and thus may receive less individualized instruction. While they are more likely to receive remedial education, it is not clear whether this represents more individualized attention or placement in the educational tracks for low achievers. Probably more important, those with economic disadvantages are more likely not to complete high school, and

as has been noted in many studies, including the NLS, dropping out of high school means lower levels of employment and incomes over one's lifetime. Thus, there appears to be a substantial trend towards the perpetuation of economic disadvantage.

2. Minorities do not receive as much schooling as do whites. Both blacks and Hispanics attend schools which have higher student-teacher and student-counselor ratios and for the most part are in segregated classrooms. Hispanics in particular have much higher dropout rates from high school than do whites. While regression analysis indicates that the rate of dropping out is in fact a function of variables other than race and ethnicity, the correlation of these variables with being black or Hispanic leads these young people to have lower percentages of high school completion. Since minorities are more likely to be poor, to be behind grade level in school, and to be from schools where the student-teacher ratio is high, their educational attainment is reduced. Under these circumstances, education will not be the mechanism for achieving racial and ethnic equality.

Chapter 6

Crime and Delinquency: Descriptions and Distributions

Joan E. Crowley

In recent years, there has been an explicit awareness that there is more than one way to earn a living. Under many conditions, crime does pay, sometimes quite well. This paper will explore the demographics of both illegal activities and official sanctions for deviant behavior.

Before going into the specific results of the development of the NLS measures, it is useful to consider some of the specific characteristics of the NLS panel as a study of illegal activity. Criminology has traditionally separated crime from delinquency, operationally based on the age of the offender. Offenses committed by legal minors are delinquency; offenses committed by legal adults are crime. Underlying the age criterion is the assumption that somehow the dynamics of adult criminal behavior differ qualitatively from the dynamics of juvenile crime, although there is certainly no consensus on exactly what the differences might be. The NLS second wave youth cohort, ranging in age from 15 to 23, crosses the boundaries between juvenile and adult activity. Fifteen has been found by some to be the peak age for delinquent activity (Berger, et al., 1975; Ageton and Elliott, 1978), so the NLS sample is quite old relative to the subjects of most delinquency studies. While this paper will continue to refer to delinquent behavior, it must be kept in mind that a large proportion of the respondents are legally adults.

It is also important to distinguish between participating in delinquent or criminal behavior and the consequences of being caught and officially processed as a delinquent or a criminal. It is quite possible to argue that official processing as delinquent or criminal tends to lock people into criminal behavior (Schur, 1973). While undetected delinquency may be quietly discontinued, the fact of being labeled publicly as criminal may have repercussions that affect the youth even after delinquent activity has ceased. The criminal justice system itself has been suggested to provide a training ground for criminal behavior, as apprentice thieves learn from more experienced "colleagues." Similarly, being "bad" enough to get yourself thrown out of school could have longer range consequences than would less public versions of misbehavior. In order, then, to separate out the effects of being caught from the effects of delinquent behavior and to provide alternate definitions of seriousness of delinquency, three sections were added to the questionnaire: delinquent behavior, police contact, and school discipline. The preliminary distributions of the responses of each are presented, focusing on the variations by sex, poverty, ethnicity, and age.

DELINQUENT BEHAVIOR[1]

The measurement of delinquent behavior in a large, heterogeneous population such as that represented by the NLS is a relatively rare phenomenon. Most studies of delinquency have been done on small and specially selected groups, with measures tailored to the specific research focus. A new delinquency index had to be developed that would suit the NLS interview setting and that would avoid some of the problems identified in the use of earlier delinquency measures. The NLS delinquency instrument was constructed to cover a wide range of activities, with a wide range of responses, administered in a format that minimized sensitivity or self-presentation effects. Details of this development are included in Appendix 1. The items used in the delinquency scale are shown in Table 6.1. Note that the first three items, running away from home, truancy, and drinking alcohol are status offenses; that is, they are behaviors forbidden only to minors. These items were asked only for youths under the age of 18. Activities described in the next 17 items are prohibited regardless of the culprit's age. A final question on the delinquency form asked how much of the respondent's support came from such activities as those listed on the form. The results for this item will be discussed following the description of delinquent activities.

---

[1] I would like to express my appreciation to Dr. Delbert Elliott for his generosity in providing both data and substantive consultation in the development of this instrument. Also freely providing the benefit of their extensive experience in this field were Drs. Lloyd Johnston, Gerald Bachman, and Martin Gold.

The response categories used are shown in Table 6.1. For reasons described in Appendix 1, it was felt that simply asking the precise number of times the respondent had participated in a prohibited activity was not feasible. The categories selected allow a detailed ordering of the relative delinquency of respondents within the sample, but, of course, the responses cannot be interpreted as absolute frequencies of activity. Rather, they should be interpreted more as scale scores, with a higher score indicating a higher level of participation in delinquent activity. To get a notion of overall delinquency, the items were divided into four scales. The status and non-status or criminal (serious) offenses were summed individually to form two scales. Then the criminal offenses were further divided by summing separately the drug related and the non-drug related offenses. Table 6.1 shows which specific items were included in each scale.

Table 6.2 shows the distributions of the self-reported delinquency items by sex,[2] showing both the percent of respondents who participated in the

---

[2] Scores on the delinquency items were calculated by assigning the midpoint of the selected response category, that is, zero, one, two, four, eight,

Table 6.1 Items on Self-Reported Delinquency Measure and Summary Scales

		Summary scales			
Abbreviated title	Item[a]	Status	Serious	Drug	Other
1. Runaway[b]	Run away from home?	*			
2. Truant[b]	Skipped a full day of school without a real excuse?	*			
3. Drinking[b]	Drank beer, wine or liquor without your parents' permission?	*			
4. Vandalism[c]	Purposely damaged or destroyed property that did not belong to you?		*		*
5. Fighting	Gotten into a physical fight at school or work?		*		*
6. Shoplifting	Taken something from a store without paying for it?		*		*
7. Petty theft	Other than from a store, taken something not belonging to you worth under $50?		*		*
8. Grand theft	Other than from a store, taken something not belonging to you worth $50 or more?		*		*
9. Robbery	Used force or strong arm methods to get money or things from a person?		*		*
10. Assault	Hit or seriously threatened to hit someone?		*		*
11. Aggravated assault	Attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting or killing them?		*		*
12. Using marijuana	Smoked marijuana or hashish (pot, grass, hash)?		*	*	
13. Using hard drugs	Used any drugs or chemicals to get high or for kicks, except marijuana?		*	*	
14. Selling marijuana	Sold marijuana or hashish?		*	*	
15. Selling hard drugs	Sold hard drugs such as heroin, cocaine, or LSD (total number of all hard drug sales)?		*	*	
16. Fraud	Tried to get something by lying to a person about what you would do for him, that is, tried to con someone?		*		*

Table 6.1 (continued)

Abbreviated title	Item[a]	Summary scales			
		Status	Serious	Drug	Other
17. Auto theft	Taken a vehicle for a ride or drive without the owner's permission?		*		*
18. Breaking and entering	Broken into a building or vehicle to steal something or just to look around?		*		*
19. Fencing	Knowingly sold or held stolen goods?		*		*
20. Gambling	Helped in a gambling operation, like running numbers or policy or books?		*		*

[a] Response categories were never, once, twice, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, 11-50 times, more than 50.

[b] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[c] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N-31,600,000).

*Item included in indicated scale.

Table 6.2 Mean Self-Reported Delinquency Items and Subscales, by Sex

Title	Female				Male				Ratio of means Male/female
	Mean	Sd.	Skew	% zero	Mean	Sd.	Skew	% zero	
Runaway[a]	.20	1.15	18.83	90	.22	1.80	23.28	91	1.1
Truant[a]	3.11	7.73	3.75	56	4.49	10.50	3.21	51	1.4
Drinking[a]	8.56	14.23	1.81	37	12.00	17.04	1.31	31	1.4
Vandalism[b]	.22	1.28	16.54	90	1.28	4.93	7.55	71	5.8
Fighting	.30	1.70	15.84	88	1.67	5.20	6.51	61	5.6
Shoplifting	.85	3.62	9.26	76	1.46	0.01	5.35	70	1.7
Petty theft	.40	2.21	13.85	86	1.11	4.51	8.04	73	2.8
Grand theft	.03	.51	48.47	99	.43	3.36	12.00	92	14.3
Robbery	.08	1.55	29.21	98	.36	2.89	13.61	92	4.5
Assault	1.21	5.31	7.49	74	2.49	6.99	5.13	52	2.1
Aggravated assault	.18	1.95	20.97	94	.76	.01	4.68	86	4.2
Using marijuana	9.38	16.94	1.64	54	13.09	20.07	1.13	49	1.4
Using hard drugs	2.05	7.49	4.74	80	2.92	9.45	3.86	77	1.4
Selling marijuana	.62	4.20	9.32	93	2.05	8.20	4.86	84	3.3
Selling hard drugs	.12	1.75	18.36	99	.45	4.13	11.05	97	3.8
Fraud	.78	4.01	9.85	82	1.44	5.81	6.70	75	1.8
Auto theft	.16	1.60	20.49	95	.44	2.88	13.36	89	2.8
Breaking & entering	.03	.44	62.64	98	.50	3.38	12.13	89	16.7
Fencing	.17	1.69	23.42	95	.82	4.24	9.10	82	4.8
Gambling	.05	1.15	36.17	99	.38	3.54	11.72	96	7.6
Status[c]	11.86	18.49	1.98	53	16.75	23.33	1.65	47	1.4
Serious[d]	16.49	30.11	3.04	31	31.49	55.85	4.51	18	1.9
Drugs	12.03	23.50	2.38	53	18.03	30.90	1.95	47	1.5
Other	4.56	13.34	7.76	45	13.44	36.05	7.63	25	2.9

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,600,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-17 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=11,200,000)

[d] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 18-23 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=30,800,000).

activity within the previous year and the mean level of involvement with the activity. The distributions of the involvement scores (not presented here) show the usual J-shaped distribution, that is, most youths either have never participated in the activity or have participated only a few times. As the level of involvement increases, the number of youths reporting that level of involvement declines rapidly. The sole exception to this tendency is use of marijuana or alcohol. The distributions of frequency of use of these drugs show that youths tend to report either very low levels of use, once or twice, suggesting experimentation, or very high levels, suggesting habitual use. Fewer than one percent of respondents report an intermediate level of involvement.

The proportion of youths participating in a particular type of offense declines as the offenses become more serious. That is, use of "soft" drugs, fighting, and petty theft are relatively common, while grand theft, selling hard drugs, and aggravated assault are relatively rare, both in terms of proportion of the population ever participating in the activity and in the mean levels of involvement.

Among minors, truancy and drinking are fairly common occurrences. The most frequent criminal offense is marijuana use. Almost half of the total sample reported using marijuana or its derivatives. For both males and

---

thirty five, and a score of 50 to those who responded in the "50 or more" category. Space prohibits showing the entire distribution for all of the items. Several descriptive statistics are shown, therefore, that summarize the shape of the distributions somewhat more concisely. The mean, of course, is just the average number of offenses committed by respondents. The standard deviation and skewness show how evenly the respondents are spread over response categories. Most youths are not very delinquent and have never committed any given offense. This means that none of the distributions have a symmetric distribution--one where about as many respondents are any given distance below the mean as above it. The less symmetrical a distribution is, the higher its skew. The standard deviation is a more common statistic and simply indicates how close the average individual score is to the group mean.

females, assault was the second most common non-status offense. Half the young men and a quarter of the young women reported at least one incident.

The status offense of running away from home is fairly infrequent, even though it is not generally considered very serious. One reason may be the age distribution of the youths, which is relatively old for a delinquency study. Youths in this sample (age 15-23) who have problems with their families are likely to have established independent living quarters. The frequency of running away is certainly affected by the duration of each incident. While a theft may take only a few minutes from conception to execution, a runaway incident involves a period of hours, days, or weeks, limiting the number of separate incidents that can occur in a twelve month span.

The scores for the subscales of delinquent activities show that, while participation in any individual activity may be uncommon, most young people report participation in some sort of delinquent activity. About half of the population under eighteen is estimated to have committed at least one status offense, and a full three quarters of all youth have committed at least one adult (serious) offense. Consistent with the mean scores for the individual items, the summary scale means show that drug use tends to have the highest levels of involvement.

As expected, there are large differences between young men and young women in the levels of delinquency. The last column in the table summarizes these sex differences by presenting the ratio of the mean level of participation for young men to the mean level for young women. For the status offenses and for less serious offenses, the ratios of involvement between males and females are fairly low. These ratios are much higher for offenses involving substantial violence or relatively large sums of money. Another way to conceptualize the pattern is to note that activities such as running away from home or using drugs to get high, which are escapist measures and also likely to involve social interactions, have similar participation levels for males and females.

Not only are young men more likely to participate in delinquent activities, but they are also more likely to participate more often than do young women. The ratios of the individual items are reflected in the ratios of the summary scores: there is a great deal of participation by both sexes in drug offenses, while criminal activities are predominately male.

The difference in crime rates between the sexes is a universal pattern in criminology. For this reason, all of the remaining data will be presented separately by sex. Other key demographic patterns to be explored include distributions by age (where adults are defined as youths 18 and older and minors as youths younger than 18), ethnicity, poverty status, and enrollment status.

Table 6.3 shows the means of the delinquency items and summary scales by sex and age. While the adults on average are more involved than minors in drug use, youths under eighteen, both males and females, are almost a third more involved in other criminal behavior than are their older counterparts.

Among women, minors are particularly active in vandalism, assaults, shoplifting, and fraud, relative to their adult counterparts. Other than drug use, there are no offenses that are substantially more frequently admitted by older women than younger ones. Among the males, the largest age differences are the higher scores of juveniles on fighting, shoplifting, petty theft, and assault, contrasted with the higher scores of adults on use and sale of drugs.

There is a popular image of delinquents as youth from homes that are impoverished both financially and emotionally. The NLS joins a growing body

Table 6.3 Mean Response for Delinquency Items and Subscales by Sex and Age

Title	Female		Male	
	Adult	Minor	Adult	Minor
Runaway[a]	-	.20	-	.22
Truant[a]	-	3.11	-	4.49
Drinking[a]	-	8.56	-	12.00
Vandalism[b]	.16	.34	1.92	1.91
Fighting	.20	.47	1.26	2.38
Shoplifting	.75	1.02	1.14	2.02
Petty theft	.37	.44	1.11	1.11
Grand theft	.02	.04	.39	.48
Robbery	.09	.06	.31	.45
Assault	.93	1.73	2.02	3.31
Aggravated assault	.15	.24	.72	.83
Using marijuana	10.38	7.54	15.35	9.18
Using hard drugs	2.29	1.62	3.55	1.83
Selling marijuana	.60	.67	2.23	1.74
Selling hard drugs	.13	.10	.50	.36
Fraud	.65	1.03	1.25	1.76
Auto theft	.12	.24	.26	.74
Breaking and entering	.02	.06	.40	.66
Fencing	.11	.21	.65	1.11
Gambling	.06	.02	.42	.32
Status[c]	-	11.86	-	16.75
Serious[d]	16.91	15.72	32.19	30.30
Drugs	13.22	9.82	21.11	12.69
Other	3.77	6.04	11.16	17.42

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,600,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-17 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=11,200,000).

[d] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 18-23 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=30,800,000).

of work seriously questioning this image.[3] One of the most sensitive issues in the demographics of crime is the apparent discrepancy between the ethnic distributions of self-reported crime and police records. Table 6.4 breaks down the delinquency items by race and sex, and shows, if anything, a higher involvement of whites in delinquent activity than blacks. Certainly the whites, both male and female, report higher levels of involvement with status offenses than do either blacks or Hispanics. Closer inspection shows that this pattern is largely due to the much higher reports of alcohol use by whites. Indeed, whites report much higher levels of drug use in general, including hard drugs, than do blacks or Hispanics.

Few major differences appear along ethnic lines when we look at the remaining offenses. Black females tend to be more likely than white or Hispanic females to report personal violence (fighting, assault). This tendency does not show up among the males, however, where whites are more likely to report involvement in fights and assaults. Generally, for both sexes, Hispanics are either intermediate between blacks and whites, or the lowest of all groups in reported level of involvement in offenses.

Despite the popular assumptions about the link between poverty and delinquency, Table 6.5 shows that, generally, when there is a difference among males between the poor and the non-poor (using the CPS definition of poverty), it is the non-poor who are most delinquent. This pattern holds particularly true for the drinking and drug use items, perhaps reflecting the use of

---

[3] The patterns for race and income have been found in other research using self-reported delinquency. The apparent contradiction between these survey findings and the population of the criminal justice system has led to questions about the accuracy of the self-report method of measuring criminal activity. A number of methodological studies on this issue have concluded that reports of criminal behavior are quite reliable and valid. See Appendix for details.

Table 6.4 Mean Response for Delinquency Items and Subscales by Sex and Race

Title	Female			Male		
	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White
Runaway[a]	.16	.37	.19	.43	.11	.20
Truant[a]	2.01	3.75	3.25	2.23	4.83	4.86
Drinking[a]	2.30	5.56	9.89	5.33	8.32	13.48
Vandalism[b]	.23	.16	.22	.89	1.08	1.36
Fighting	.56	.48	.23	1.43	1.62	1.71
Shoplifting	.71	.81	.87	1.41	1.74	1.45
Petty theft	.27	.37	.42	.76	.96	1.18
Grand theft	.06	.08	.02	.44	.40	.43
Robbery	.11	.03	.08	.54	.25	.34
Assault	1.57	.72	1.19	2.20	1.96	2.58
Aggravated assault	.26	.10	.17	.93	.63	.74
Using marijuana	5.67	6.23	10.28	9.13	9.19	14.04
Using hard drugs	.61	1.32	2.36	1.21	1.58	3.30
Selling marijuana	.26	.32	.71	1.32	.90	2.26
Selling hard drugs	.11	.08	.13	.30	.05	.51
Fraud	1.15	.30	.75	1.66	.97	1.44
Auto theft	.14	.12	.17	.40	.22	.46
Breaking and entering	.02	.05	.04	.39	.42	.52
Fencing	.17	.12	.17	.85	1.00	.80
Gambling	.10	.02	.04	.50	.31	.37
Status[c]	4.47	9.72	13.30	8.02	13.29	18.57
Serious[d]	11.71	11.37	17.72	23.84	22.66	33.39
Drugs	6.50	7.79	13.32	11.69	11.55	19.55
Other	5.39	3.48	4.50	12.20	10.92	13.83

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,600,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-17 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=11,200,000).

[d] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 18-23 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=30,800,000).

Table 6.5 Mean Response for Delinquency Items and Subscales by Sex and Poverty Status

Title	Female		Male	
	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Nonpoverty	Poverty
Runaway[a]	.17	.32	.17	.55
Truant[a]	3.03	3.17	4.27	5.48
Drinking[a]	9.16	5.32	12.97	7.47
Vandalism[b]	.23	.22	1.34	1.03
Fighting	.24	.52	1.67	1.77
Shoplifting	.84	.87	1.53	1.24
Petty theft	.42	.29	1.14	1.13
Grand theft	.03	.05	.42	.62
Robbery	.08	.11	.36	.34
Assault	1.15	1.66	2.54	2.14
Aggravated assault	.16	.28	.72	.77
Using marijuana	9.49	8.76	13.29	10.83
Using hard drugs	2.16	1.52	2.96	2.05
Selling marijuana	.61	.50	2.02	1.71
Selling hard drugs	.14	.07	.43	.41
Fraud	.74	.94	1.51	.98
Auto theft	.18	.12	.43	.32
Breaking and entering	.03	.05	.52	.43
Fencing	.15	.29	.84	.84
Gambling	.03	.07	.36	.49
Status[c]	12.38	8.84	17.42	13.60
Serious[d]	16.54	16.08	31.88	26.93
Drugs	12.20	10.80	18.21	14.62
Other	4.40	5.58	13.68	12.23

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=10,800,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=29,200,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-17 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=10,700,000).

[d] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 18-23 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=28,500,000).

discretionary income for recreational chemicals. Males from non-poor families are also more likely to report vandalism, shoplifting, assault, and fraud.

As usual, the pattern is much different for females. More affluent women, like their male siblings, are more likely to report alcohol and drug use than are poor women. However, the only other offense reported substantially more frequently by the non-poor women is petty theft. Poor women report more involvement with offenses involving personal violence--fighting, assault, and aggravated assault.

Poor youths, both male and female, report higher levels of running away and truancy. While any finding based on such simple analysis must be interpreted cautiously, the implication of greater disturbance in family relationships among poor youth may have significance for the perpetuation of poverty. Perhaps the most important observation to be made from this table is the lack of evidence for the assumption that poverty breeds crime.[4]

Table 6.6 shows the mean levels of delinquent activity broken down by enrollment status. For males, the results are consistent and dramatic. In every category, dropouts report high levels of delinquent activity relative to students and high school graduates. Like minors, they report high levels of violence against people and property. Like adults, they report high levels of drug use and of drug sales. Conversely, college students, the youths who are most successful academically, have the lowest levels of delinquent involvement. Although the NLS contradicts the popular view that race is associated with delinquency, this result supports the popular view that those

---

[4] Recent research indicates that the supposed association between social class and crime is very weak even in police contact data (Tittle, Villemez, and Smith, 1978). The 1981 meetings of the American Society of Criminology devoted an entire session to the association between class and crime, and similarly came to the conclusion that, at least in the 1970s, the link is generally weak to non-significant.

Table 6.6 Mean Response for Delinquency Items and Subscales by Sex and Enrollment Status

Title	Female				Male			
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate
Runaway[a]	.81	.16	.08	.18	1.17	.14	.0	1.34
Truant[a]	7.44	2.64	3.15	13.01	15.51	3.45	5.73	22.13
Drinking[a]	10.53	8.38	10.18	10.49	14.66	11.64	27.70	24.55
Vandalism[b]	.18	.33	.19	.14	1.73	1.59	.74	1.00
Fighting	.55	.43	.07	.19	2.72	2.04	.72	1.28
Shoplifting	1.05	.93	.68	.78	2.05	1.81	.93	1.06
Petty theft	.37	.42	.46	.35	1.75	.97	.87	1.15
Grand theft	.10	.02	.01	.02	1.24	.31	.07	.44
Robbery	.11	.05	.09	.11	.79	.38	.09	.30
Assault	1.46	1.68	.54	1.00	3.31	3.06	1.33	2.07
Aggravated assault	.27	.20	.18	.13	1.67	.70	.46	.62
Using marijuana	12.35	6.99	9.90	10.64	19.46	8.35	12.16	17.24
Using hard drugs	3.18	1.46	1.93	2.37	4.87	1.70	2.85	3.75
Selling marijuana	.89	.58	.35	.73	4.64	1.54	1.25	2.09
Selling hard drugs	.43	.06	.09	.10	1.28	.28	.38	.37
Fraud	.69	1.00	.58	.69	2.00	1.66	.57	1.42
Auto theft	.17	.22	.04	.16	.68	.63	.10	.27

Table 6.6 (continued)

Title	Female				Male			
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate
Breaking and entering	.08	.04	.03	.02	1.15	.51	.17	.39
Fencing	.24	.19	.07	.17	1.62	.94	.33	.61
Gambling	.09	.01	.04	.07	.78	.29	.16	.47
Status[c]	18.53	11.19	13.42	23.80	31.50	15.26	33.44	48.54
Serious[d]	21.52	14.55	15.24	17.53	52.07	26.71	23.20	34.20
Drugs	16.24	9.04	12.19	13.68	29.00	11.56	16.26	23.06
Other	5.64	5.61	3.07	3.92	22.54	15.05	6.92	11.40

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,600,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 14-17 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=11,200,000).

[d] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 18-23 as of the interview date who responded to all items on the questionnaire (N=30,800,000).

who do less well in school have higher levels of criminal involvement.

Among females, differentiation by enrollment status is much less pronounced. Dropouts report higher levels of delinquent involvement than do students and graduates for only thirteen of the 20 offenses, which is still a majority of the items, but far from the consistent pattern for males.

ILLEGAL INCOME

The key link between crime and employment logically lies in the degree to which crime serves as an alternative source of income. It is clearly not reasonable to expect that even professional thieves will know with any accuracy how much they net from their activities over any extensive period of time. With no accountability to the tax collector or to anyone else, there is simply no incentive for toting up the take. However, it was decided to attempt to gauge subjectively the degree to which the youth looked to crime as a source of financial support by asking about what fraction of their total support was derived from such activities as those described on the delinquency form. This question is assumed to provide a differentiation of those who use crime as a significant supplement to more socially acceptable forms of income from those who do not. It should be noted in interpreting the results that the same amount of income represents a smaller proportion of support for more affluent youths.

Table 6.7 shows the distributions of the proportion of income from illegal activities, broken down by race, income, age, and educational status. Most youth do not profit from their activities, but a substantial minority, slightly over twenty percent of the young men and ten percent of the young women, get at least some of their support from "crime." About one male in twenty reports getting one fourth or more of his support from such

Table 6.7 Illegal Income by Participant Characteristics

(Percentage distributions)

	Proportion of illegal income									
	Female					Male				
	None	Very little	One-fourth	At least a half	Total	None	Very little	One-fourth	At least a half	Total
Race										
Black	87	10	1	2	100	73	18	3	6	100
Hispanic	91	7	1	1	100	79	17	2	2	100
White	90	8	1	1	100	79	17	2	2	100
Income status										
Nonpoverty	90	8	1	1	100	79	17	2	2	100
Poverty	87	10	1	2	100	76	18	2	4	100
Age status										
Adults	91	7	1	1	100	81	16	2	2	100
Minors	87	10	1	2	100	75	19	3	4	100
Enrollment status										
High school dropout	80	16	2	2	100	67	25	3	5	100
High school student	88	19	1	2	100	77	17	2	4	100
College student	95	5	*	*	100	87	12	*	*	100
Nonenrolled high school graduate	90	8	1	1	100	80	16	2	2	100

*Percentage between .01 and .05.

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=28,800,000).

sources. The expected race and income differences do show up on Table 6.7, but the differences are fairly small, especially when the base levels of income are taken into account. As with the reports of delinquent behavior, in fact, the variables most consistently related to illegal income are sex and enrollment status. One third of the male high school dropouts and one fifth of the female dropouts get at least some income from crime. The group with the lowest frequency of illegal income of all categories on the table is, as expected, college students.

REPORTED POLICE CONTACTS

Delinquent activity may or may not lead to involvement with the police and with the courts. A separate section of the NLS interview assessed the youths' lifetime experiences with the formal criminal justice system. The specific areas included are discussed in Appendix 2.

Table 6.8 shows the distributions of police and criminal justice involvment broken down by sex and poverty.[5] The first row of the table shows the proportions of each sex-income group who report any contact with police. The remainder of the table refers to the proportions of those who report any contact and who further report various levels of involvement with the criminal justice system. This method facilitates comparisons of levels of involvement across groups independent of the proportion of each group who manage to stay completely out of the system.

As with delinquency, females report lower levels of involvement than

---

[5] Since the police contact items asked for incidents over the respondent's entire life span, there is an artificial correlation between age and frequency of reported contact. Older youths have had more time to come to the attention of the police than have their younger siblings. For this reason, age will not be used as a descriptor of police contacts.

Table 6.8 Incidence of Being Stopped, Charged or Convicted, by Sex and Poverty Status

Seriousness	Female		Male	
	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Nonpoverty	Poverty
Percent of population	42	8	43	7
Stopped, charged or convicted[a]	10	14	33	37
Among those ever stopped, charged or convicted[b]				
Stopped	79	70	82	82
Charged	31	47	41	53
Charged as adult	12	16	19	21
Convicted	15	23	23	32
Convicted as adult	6	8	12	15
Counseling	27	31	20	25
Probation	13	17	23	36
Incarcerated	5	7	7	19
Incarcerated as youth	4	7	4	12
Incarcerated as adult	*	0	4	9

*Percentage is 0.1-0.5.

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=30,100,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date who reported ever being stopped, charged, or convicted (N=5,400,000).

males. Over a third of the young men report some police contact. The proportion for young women is closer to one tenth. Of those who do come in contact with the police, the sex difference is much less pronounced; but even given an initial contact with police, young women are less likely than young men to be charged, convicted, placed on probation, or incarcerated. Females do tend to report referral to counseling programs more often than males.

Some interesting patterns emerge when the levels of involvement by poor and non-poor youths are considered. There is no difference by income in frequency for males in being stopped by police without further processing, and poor females are actually somewhat less likely than more affluent females to be simply stopped by police. However, poor youth are consistently more likely to be formally charged, convicted, and put on probation or incarcerated than are non-poor youth. In fact, the more serious the level of involvement with the criminal justice system, the more discrepant the rates by income status. Of those who come into contact with the police, about one fifth of both poor and nonpoor males report being convicted of an offense. However, poor males are almost three times as likely as non-poor youth to report incarceration. The pattern for females is similar, although less dramatic. These results contrast sharply with the greater involvement with delinquent behavior reported by non-poor youth.

Table 6.9 shows police involvement by enrollment status. Out of school youths, particularly dropouts, have the highest levels of involvement. Over half of the male dropouts have come in contact with the police. Of these, two fifths report a conviction of an offense, and one quarter report a conviction as an adult. Probation and incarceration are also fairly common among dropouts. Perhaps the most useful group for comparison with the dropouts is the nonenrolled high school graduates.[6] Among males, the same sort of

Table 6.9 Incidence of Being Stopped, Charged or Convicted, by Sex and Enrollment Status

Seriousness	Female				Male			
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate
Percent of population	6	18	9	17	7	20	9	15
Stopped, charged or convicted[a]	21	10	6	12	57	30	24	36
Among those ever stopped, charged, or convicted[b]								
Stopped	61	89	80	76	76	86	86	80
Charged	57	21	27	37	65	32	31	49
Charged as adult	10	*	19	19	36	4	17	31
Convicted	26	14	*	15	41	19	9	29
Convicted as adult	9	*	*	9	25	2	*	19
Counseling	41	21	*	10	31	18	14	19
Probation	25	10	*	5	47	18	*	26
Incarcerated	14	*	*	*	26	4	*	7
Incarcerated as youth	10	*	*	*	15	3	*	2
Incarcerated as adult	*	0	*	*	14	*	*	6

*Percentage is 0.1-0.5.

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=32,600,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date who reported ever being stopped, charged or convicted (N=7,300,000).

increasing differentiation of level of involvement with the criminal justice system appears as was noted for poverty. Among those with police contact, there is a moderate difference between high school dropouts and high school graduates in the percent charged with an offense--two thirds of the dropouts compared with half of the high school graduates. Dropouts are, however, almost four times as likely to be incarcerated as are high school graduates and over seven times more likely to report being incarcerated in juvenile institutions. The patterns are quite similar for females, allowing for their generally lower level both of initial contact and of serious involvement following contact.

The results for poverty and enrollment status, which are quite consistent with the general image of youths in the criminal justice system, encourage confidence in the validity of the responses to the interview. This very consistency, however, raises questions of inequity in view of the lack of relationship between poverty and delinquent behavior as reported by the youth.

The patterns shown in Table 6.10, criminal justice involvement by race and sex, do not show any consistent tendency for minority youths either to report higher levels of initial contact or to report greater levels of involvment with the system after initial contact. Closer observation shows a pattern subtly similar to the one shown for income and enrollment status. While black youth are actually less likely than whites to be charged with offenses or convicted, blacks are more likely to be put on probation or

---

[6] The comparisons of high school dropouts with other enrollment groups is complicated by the difference in age distributions. High school students are, on average, younger than dropouts, while college students and high school graduates are somewhat older. Both high school graduates and dropouts, however, are out of regular school, and presumably face similar problems in entry into adult roles. The relative age of the enrollment groups makes the comparison a conservative one, since the age difference would give the graduates more opportunity to come in contact with the law.

Table 6.10 Incidence of Being Stopped, Charged or Convicted, by Sex and Race

Seriousness	Female			Male		
	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White
Percent of population	7	3	40	7	3	40
Stopped, charged or convicted[a]	8	13	11	36	36	34
Among those stopped, charged or convicted[b]						
Stopped	79	78	76	81	83	82
Charged	31	35	36	41	49	45
Charged as adult	14	12	13	19	20	22
Convicted	10	19	18	22	25	26
Convicted as adult	*	9	7	12	11	13
Counseling	23	24	29	16	19	22
Probation	15	11	14	28	26	26
Incarcerated	*	*	6	12	13	9
Incarcerated as youth	*	*	5	7	7	5
Incarcerated as adult	*	0	*	8	7	5

*Percentage is 0.1-0.5.

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=32,600,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date who reported ever being stopped, charged or convicted (N=7,300,000).

incarcerated. All of these differences are extremely small, and given the relationship between income and race in current American society, it is likely that they reflect the patterns observed for poverty. Interpretation of these results must be extremely cautious at this time, since there is no control for the type of offense with which individuals are charged, and type of offense is the single major determinant of sentence severity. Table 6.11 provides some confirmation that part of the discrepancy can be accounted for by type of offense: the figures shown are the major offense categories for which young men have ever been convicted.[7] Major traffic offenses, vandalism, and possession of marijuana were mentioned more frequently by whites than by blacks, but black males were more likely to report a conviction for assault or robbery. The direction if not the magnitude of these differences in conviction rates by race are echoed in the frequency of report of the individual offenses on the delinquent behavior measure.

SCHOOL DISCIPLINE

The schools exercise a quasi-judiciary control over youths, meting out punishment for infractions of school-imposed regulations. The final measure of delinquent behavior, then, is suspension or expulsion from school. This section simply asked the number of times suspended or expelled and the dates of the most recent incident.[8]

---

[7] The question asked the respondent to list all charges on which he or she had ever been convicted, so that any individual could have reported in any or all of the possible categories. Several other types of offenses were coded, but were mentioned so infrequently that no clear conclusions can be drawn. Similarly, the frequency of convictions for females was so low that no meaningful subgroup analysis could be done, so the table represents only males.

[8] As with police contact, there is an artificial correlation between age and being suspended or expelled from school. See footnote 4.

Table 6.11 Type of Conviction for Males, by Race

Type of conviction	Black	Hispanic	White	Total
Percent of population[a]	13	6	80	100
Convicted[b]	8	9	9	9
Assault	19	12	12	12
Robbery	19	12	4	7
Theft	30	32	31	31
Vandalism	5	7	11	10
Breaking and entering	13	9	15	14
Possession, marijuana	5	6	14	12
Major traffic offense	8	19	21	20
Drinking under age	*	9	12	10

*Percentage is 0.1-0.5.

[a] Civilian males age 15-23 on interview date. UNIVERSE: 16,200,000.

[b] Civilian males age 15-23 on interview date ever convicted. UNIVERSE: 1,400,000.

Suspension from school is a common occurrence, especially for young men. Table 6.12 shows the distributions for school discipline broken down by sex and poverty status. Poor youth are much more likely to report being disciplined. Females from families below the poverty line are more than twice as likely as the non-poor to report being suspended. Perhaps because the base rates are so much lower, the ratios of expulsions between poor and non-poor are even larger than the ratios for suspensions. Poor youth are almost three times more likely to be expelled than are the non-poor.

Table 6.13 shows that, as expected from the poverty results, black respondents are substantially more likely to be suspended or expelled than are either whites or Hispanics. While there is little difference between whites and Hispanics among males, female Hispanics fall midway between whites and blacks in the proportion ever suspended or expelled. Again, among those who have ever been disciplined by the schools, there is relatively little variation in the number of times they have been disciplined, at least among males. Black females do seem to report more frequent suspensions than whites, although the figures on the number of expulsions show equal frequencies for both groups.

It is not surprising that school dropouts report the highest frequency of both suspensions and expulsions of any of the groups shown (Table 6.14), and, indeed, almost three fifths of the male dropouts have been suspended, most of them more than once. Male dropouts who have ever been suspended report an average of more than five suspensions each, with one youth in eight reporting more than ten separate suspensions. As with delinquency and police contacts, the proportion of young men who have ever been suspended or expelled is much greater than the proportion of young women, even among the the dropouts. Also as before, the variation among groups is higher for ever being disciplined

Table 6.12 Reported School Discipline, by Sex and Poverty Status

School discipline	Female			Male		
	Total	Nonpoverty	Poverty	Total	Nonpoverty	Poverty
Percent of population	50	42	8	50	43	7
Ever suspended[a]	14	12	26	30	26	38
Frequency, for those ever suspended[b]						
1	60	63	55	44	45	38
2	17	17	18	18	19	16
3	7	6	10	10	9	12
4	5	5	4	7	7	10
5	3	3	2	5	5	4
6-10	4	3	6	8	7	12
11+	3	2	4	7	7	7
NA	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mean	2.7	2.4	2.9	3.7	3.4	4.4
Ever expelled[a]	2	1	3	5	4	12
Frequency, for those ever expelled[c]						
1	67	67	66	60	63	55
2	13	10	20	15	13	17
3+	17	18	*	23	21	27
NA	3	5	0	2	3	1
Mean	2.2	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.1	2.4

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date (N=30,100,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 ever suspended (N=6,300,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 ever expelled (N=1,000,000).

Table 6.13 Reported School Discipline, by Sex and Race

School discipline	Female			Male		
	Black	Hispanic	White	Black	Hispanic	White
Percent of population	7	3	40	7	3	40
Ever suspended[a]	28	17	12	45	27	26
Frequency, for those ever suspended[b]						
1	53	59	64	39	44	45
2	17	16	16	21	18	18
3	10	8	6	13	12	9
4	5	6	5	7	6	7
5	5	4	2	3	4	5
6-10	4	5	4	11	8	7
11+	5	2	2	4	5	7
NA	1	0	1	2	2	1
Mean	2.9	2.3	2.5	3.5	3.6	3.8
Ever expelled[a]	4	3	1	12	5	4
Frequency, for those ever expelled[c]						
1	72	80	62	52	60	67
2	8	17	14	22	20	10
3+	18	3	20	25	18	20
NA	2	0	4	1	2	3
Mean	2.5	1.3	2.5	2.2	1.7	2.4

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date (N=32,600,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date ever suspended (N=6,900,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date ever expelled (N=1,100,000).

Table 6.14 Reported School Discipline by Sex and Enrollment Status

School discipline	Female				Male			
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate
Percent of population	6	18	9	17	6	20	9	15
Ever suspended[a]	35	12	6	14	57	34	11	29
Frequency, for those ever suspended[b]								
1	42	69	68	67	25	54	59	45
2	20	14	18	15	18	17	16	21
3	12	5	*	6	13	8	11	9
4	6	5	*	4	10	6	*	6
5	6	2	*	*	6	5	0	6
6-10	5	4	*	4	15	6	*	6
11+	8	*	0	*	12	3	*	6
NA	1	0	0	2	1	1	3	1
Mean	3.9	2.1	1.7	2.2	5.3	2.8	3.1	3.2

Table 6.14 (continued)

School discipline	Female				Male			
	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate	High school dropout	High school student	College student	Nonenrolled high school graduate
Ever expelled	6	1	1	2	22	3	1	3
Frequency, for those ever expelled[c]								
1	60	74	*	69	61	55	47	77
2	21	*	0	*	11	23	28	10
3+	18	*	*	*	26	19	8	13
NA	1	0	0	10	2	19	17	0
Mean	3.0	1.4	1.9	1.7	2.5	1.9	1.7	1.8

[a] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date (N=32,600,000).

[b] UNIVERSE: Civilians 15-23 on interview date ever suspended (N=6,900,000).

[c] UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date ever expelled (N=1,100,000).

than for the average number of disciplinary events among those who have experienced the sanctions.

Our data do not allow us to determine whether the variations in school suspension and expulsion rates reflect differences in the ways that schools approach youths or differences in the real frequency of serious infractions of school regulations. Confidence in the face validity of the items is supported by the sharp differentiation in rates by enrollment status. The small differences in average frequencies among those ever disciplined suggest a threshhold phenomenon, where once a youth reaches the level of the first suspension or expulsion, the likelihood of a repetition is fairly independent of demographic characteristics.

CONSISTENCY OF DELINQUENCY MEASURES

Tables 6.15 and 6.16 compare the distributions of delinquency measures against each other. Aside from the intrinsic interest of the joint distributions of these phenomena, the comparisons provide the closest approximation to a validity check available for the measures of delinquency.

Table 6.15 shows the mean scores on the major delinquency subscales by whether or not the youth reported any incidents of school discipline or police contacts. As expected, the youth who report such events are consistently higher on each of the subscales than those who do not report them. Moreover, the greater the seriousness of the level of school discipline or the seriousness of the police contact, the greater the contrast in delinquency scores between those who report the sanction and those who do not.

Table 6.16 presents the relationship between police contact and school discipline. The reports of ever being suspended or expelled were used to define four groups, in ascending order of expected delinquency: never

Table 6.15 Self-Reported Delinquency Means by Incidence of School Discipline and Police Contact and by Sex

Problem	Female			Male		
	Status	Drugs	Other	Status	Drugs	Other
Total population	11.86	12.03	4.56	16.75	18.04	13.44
Suspended						
Yes	21.69	24.66	9.46	28.12	32.17	24.01
No	10.36	9.96	3.76	12.52	12.64	9.43
Expelled						
Yes	27.07	23.35	11.02	34.48	39.17	34.53
No	11.64	11.82	4.56	15.96	16.95	12.37
Stopped						
Yes	27.93	28.05	10.32	28.60	30.85	24.57
No	10.25	10.56	4.04	12.41	13.10	9.12
Charged						
Yes	38.24	41.85	14.65	35.36	40.34	31.34
No	11.11	10.85	4.16	14.15	14.20	10.39
Convicted						
Yes	36.25	41.22	16.39	37.97	46.09	40.10
No	11.49	11.49	4.39	15.10	15.46	10.99

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,000,000).

Table 6.16 Relationship Between Police Contact and School Discipline, by Sex

(Percentage distributions)

	Female				Male			
	Not suspended	Not expelled	Suspended	Expelled	Not suspended	Not expelled	Suspended	Expelled
Total population	86	98	14	2	72	95	28	5
Stopped								
Yes	7	8	18	16	22	27	43	51
No	93	92	82	84	78	73	67	49
Charged								
Yes	3	4	12	23	9	13	31	50
No	97	96	88	77	81	87	69	50
Convicted								
Yes	1	2	6	12	5	7	18	35
No	99	98	94	88	95	93	82	65

UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=32,600,000).

Comments: Expected patterns; youths in trouble in school report more extensive involvements with police.

suspended, never expelled (includes some youths who had been suspended, as well as all those who have never been dismissed from school), suspended, and expelled. The prediction of ascending probability of police contact is supported in the table. Among young men who have been expelled from school, half have been booked and over a third have a conviction, compared to one tenth and one twentieth, respectively, for those who have never been suspended. The pattern is somewhat less graphic among females, not surprisingly, considering their lower overall levels of police contact and school discipline.

SUMMARY

Despite the sensitivity of the subject material, one conclusion from this analysis is an assurance that the measures of delinquent behavior, police involvement, and experience of school discipline seemed to produce reasonable and consistent results both with respect to each other and with respect to previous findings. By any measure, criminal or disruptive behavior is widespread. Marijuana and its derivatives have been used at least once by almost half of the total sample, and use is particularly widespread among young adults. Fewer than half of the respondents report never having been involved in any of the criminal activities on the index. One third of the males report some form of police contact. About a third of the males and a sixth of the females have at some time been suspended from school.

Sex and enrollment status had strong and consistent relationships with all measures. Enrollment status, which is to a large extent self-selected, has a much more consistent relationship with both delinquent behavior and with involvement with social control systems than do unselected demographic categories like race and poverty. The weak and inconsistent relationships of race and poverty with self-reported delinquent behavior, while counter to the popular stereotypes of delinquents or adult criminals, are in line with findings from previous studies using self report measures (Hirschi, 1969; Ageton and Elliott, 1978). Middle income and white youth are not terribly much different in their actual delinquent behavior from poor and minority youth.

The discrepancies between delinquency patterns from self-report and from police contact data have generated much debate in the criminological literature. Certainly, such patterns suggest the possibility of ethnic or class bias in the criminal justice system. NLS data also show this discrepancy: we find very small differences along income and ethnic lines in reported delinquency and in probability of contact with the police, but large differences based on income level and race when youth enter the formal correctional system, probation and incarceration.

Processes other than prejudice have been advanced to account for the observed patterns. Ageton and Elliott's work suggests that, while similar proportions of whites and blacks report some level of delinquent activity, black youth are much more likely than whites to be found among those who commit crimes very frequently. Such highly delinquent youth are properly the focus of more intensive police and judicial attention than are the more casually delinquent.

In determining which youths are to be dealt with by diversion, probation, or incarceration, courts may take into account the resources available to the child's family. Middle class families are more able to afford private counseling, for example, than are the poor.[9]

---

[9] It has also been suggested that highly delinquent youth might understate their involvement with delinquent activity, while non-delinquent youth might

In this way, even when a criminal justice system that does not deliberately treat youths from poor or minority homes more harshly than youth from the white middle class, socially disadvantaged youth are more likely to end up in the correctional system. To the extent that the popular image of delinquent youth continues to exaggerate the relationship between social status and criminal behavior, the associated stigma makes it more difficult for disadvantaged youth to avoid the appearance of being a possible threat to others. Clearly, the social labelling process has the potential for imposing yet another barrier to employment on the poor and on blacks.

---

exaggerate their misbehavior, either in order to present themselves favorably to the interviewer, or from selective memory processes. Gold (1970) in a validation study found some underreporting, but concluded that the self-reported delinquency technique was basically valid. The administration technique developed for the NLS was specifically designed to avoid self-presentational bias.

Chapter 6 APPENDIX 1

There are two basic sources of information about the criminal activities of individuals: official records and self-report. Criminological literature abounds with discussions of which is more valid, with no clear decisions reached one way or the other. Pragmatically, the NLS is limited to self-report measures or to none at all, since costs, not to mention confidentiality problems, rule out a search of police records for such a large number of youth. Even were police records available, it is well known that most delinquent behavior never reaches official attention, that recording policies vary widely from department to department, and that bookkeeping errors add further to the unreliability of the information attained.

Early self-reported delinquency measures tended to key on a very limited set of activities. When results indicated much lower variation in delinquent behavior by race, sex, and income level than was observed in the population of youths involved with the criminal justice system, the findings were faulted on the narrow range and the relatively trivial nature of the offenses included in the scales. More recent instruments have expanded the number of behaviors assessed and have permitted the development of indexes that exclude trivial offenses. A final refinement has been elimination of the truncation problem. Most delinquency instruments categorize responses into zero, one, two, or more than two incidents. Elliott and Ageton (1980) contend that this truncation obscures real variation in delinquent behavior. In their results, the youths who commit very large numbers of offenses are much more like youths involved in the criminal justice system than are youths with less frequent delinquent behavior.

Critics of the self-report technique also point out the sensitivity of the material, arguing alternately that youths will want to present themselves in a positive light, and therefore will conceal their true behavior from an interviewer, or that youths will want to make themselves seem tougher or more adventurous by making up events. In many ways, this is the central question of validity and the criticism least vulnerable to resolution, one way or another. Solutions generally hinge on making clear to the respondents that there will be no use of their responses to identify them as individuals and using non-evaluative interviewer styles to reduce self-presentation incentives.

Several studies have documented the accuracy of self-reported delinquent behavior scales. Most of these studies have used reverse record checks, where researchers asked a sample of youths to report their delinquent behavior, then checked police records to see if the two sources matched. Hardt and Peterson-Hardt (1977) actually found that many of the discrepancies could be tied to inaccuracies in police record keeping. All such studies reviewed to date conclude that youths by and large report delinquent activity accurately, well within the bounds of accuracy expected from such factors as memory fade and question comprehension. The most extensive study to date of the validity of self-reported delinquenty cautions that there may be some suppression of reporting by some highly delinquent categories of youngsters (Hindeland, Hirschi, and Weis, 1981). However, the researchers did find a generally high level of agreement between self-reports and police records.

The Self-Reported Delinquency index was derived from three major sources. The most direct predecessor was a series of items developed by Delbert Elliott for the National Surveys of Youth, a panel study of delinquency. Elliott determined the most common offenses for which youths were involved with the criminal justice system based on official records and constructed 47 items asking about such activities, using colloquial terms to describe the behaviors rather than formal legal charges. In another program of research, Gold (1970) screened youths on whether they had ever participated in 17 types of behavior. For each activity confessed, the interviewer then asked a series of questions designed to elicit a detailed description of the circumstances surrounding the offence, such as the presence of other youths, the exact nature of the activity (e. g., what was stolen, or what type of building was broken into). The details allowed the elimination of trivial activities, those that fit the colloquial descriptions used in the interview but that are unlikely to be considered as illegal. An example of this coding would be for the item on hitting someone else. This is assault, legally, but hitting a sibling during a quarrel is unlikely to be considered a delinquent behavior. For each item, Gold and his colleagues developed specific criteria for coding the event as trivial and deleting the incident from consideration in the measurement of delinquency. Bachman and Johnston (1978) used Gold's items to develop a self-administered questionnaire instrument that was filled out by high school youths in classroom settings.

None of these instruments was directly appropriate to the NLS. The preservation of the respondent's faith in the confidentiality of the information is vital to facilitate honest responses. In the Gold and Elliott studies, the interviews with youths were conducted outside the home, with no other persons present besides the interviewer and the respondent. The Bachman and Johnston questionnaire was group administered as part of a much longer instrument. There was no feasible way that anyone connected with the youth would know what an individual's responses were to any part of the instrument, unless the youths themselves discussed the activities. There was also no need for special instructions to be read to the respondents, since the format for the delinquency items was identical to that used for several pages of previous questions. Neither the anonymity of group administration nor the privacy of a neutral setting was available to the NLS. Youths are interviewed in their homes, often with other family members close by. It is unlikely that a youngster would be willing to admit illegal activities if a parent were within earshot. Time was also a serious constraint. Delinquent activity was the major focus of both the Gold and Elliott studies, and the measures used were elaborate and lengthy. What was required for the NLS was the most comprehensive possible measure that could be administered in a very short time, and that preserved the confidence of the respondent in the protection of sensitive information. The goal was to provide differentiation of the youths who were heavily involved with delinquency from those who were less so, avoiding the truncation problem and using a broad range of items to tap the varieties of delinquent behavior.

The format selected was a modification of the questionnaire procedure. Youths were handed a form on which was printed the list of delinquent activities. This technique has been used in drug-use studies that operate under similar constraints of in-home interviewing. Respondents were instructed to check the blank on the form that corresponded to the number of times they had done the activity in the previous twelve months. The 12-month period was selected to minimize the problem of memory decay and to remove the artificial correlation of delinquency with age that occurs if you ask how often respondents have ever commilted an offense. Since neither the items nor the responses were read aloud, it was hoped that the confidentiality of the material would be emphasized, and the youths would feel free to answer honestly. It was made clear in the instructions that the answers to these items, like the rest of the interview, would be completely confidential, and that they were not obliged to answer any or all of the questions. As a final step to try to defuse the sensitivity of the information, respondents were asked to put the delinquency form in an envelope and seal it, so that the interviewer did not see the answers. It has been argued that suspicious youths might believe that, regardless of the assurances, the interviewer would simply open the envelope after leaving the premises. It is my experience that there is generally a trust built up between respondents and professional interviewers, such that this is unlikely to be a serious problem. In any case, youths with such fears are not expected to be reachable by any other technique available to the average researcher.

Distributions obtained from the first wave of the National Youth Survey (NYS) panel study were used in item selection, eliminating items that were relatively rare in the population. Wording for most of the items was adapted from the NYS as well, although in some cases it was felt that the Gold or Bachman and Johnston items were more appropriate to the NLS situation. Since one of the research priorities was the investigation of possible substitution of illegal earnings for market earnings, the selection of items was weighted toward income-producing activities. Also, because of the focus on earnings, one item not previously used was constructed. This was a question on participation in gambling operations, worded to try to eliminate responses about casual card-playing and the like. The NYS distributions were also the basis for the response categories. The NYS asked the total number of times a youth had participated in each behavior. For the NLS, however, this question was inappropriate for two reasons. First, having taken elaborate precautions to assure confidentiality, it was clear that youths who had committed delinquent acts would take significantly longer to answer the form than would those who could simply write zero for each response, and that this signal could be easily worked out by both respondent and interviewer, as well as, perhaps, by non-interviewed household members. Second, and equally persuasive, was the time constraint on the total instrument. Checking a general category would be faster than trying to recall an exact number of events, especially for moderately delinquent youths. The perceptive reader will have noted that, even given the use of categories, neither of these objectives were completely fulfilled. While highly delinquent youths could simply check the highest category and completely non-delinquent youths could check the zero category, youths who had participated in an activity a few times still had to count up mentally the events in order to respond accurately. Also, given the lay-out, interviewers familiar with the form could surmise the category chosen by watching the respondent. At this point, we can only hope that the procedure chosen allowed a moderate improvement in the quality of the information obtained.

The use of response categories means that we cannot make statements about the absolute frequency of delinquency in the sample. Rather, the responses are more interpretable as scale scores. This is not as great a loss as it might seem. First, the more often an individual has participated in an activity, the more error is expected in the frequency report. A youth who has tried marijuana twice is more likely to report precisely two incidents than a youth who has used the substance 57 times is to report precisely 57 incidents. Thus, even if we ask the exact number of incidents, we expect a great deal of error in the upper ranges. This means little real precision is lost by categorizing widely in those ranges. Second, experience with reports of income have shown that asking for exact amounts of income results in a large frequency of don't know responses, and therefore a great deal of missing data. People seem to be more willing, and more comfortable, in reporting the range in which their income falls. While there is no direct test, it is probable that assuming a parallel response pattern between income reports and delinquency reports is reasonable. In the present case, using categories that allow fairly detailed discrimination of levels of delinquency with minimum amounts of missing data is much more important than being able to get seemingly more precise estimates of absolute frequency.

Scores on the delinquency items were calculated by assigning the midpoint of the selected response category and assigning a score of 50 to those who responded in the "50 or more" category. Table 6A.1 shows for each item the percentage of respondents who did not give an answer. The figures in Table 6A.1 represent unweighted percentages, in order to give an idea of the absolute magnitude of the underreporting. No doubt, some of the non-responses were simply inadvertent skips in filling out the form, but we will consider most of them to be refusals. Using refusal rate as a criterion, it is clear that there is some suppression of reported delinquent activity, since about 2.5 percent of the sample refused to answer any items, and the items with the highest refusal rates are generally those with the highest levels of participation. The most sensitive items of all are the drug items. Adults were more likely to refuse to answer than were minors. Overall, however, the overwhelming majority of respondents answered the questions, despite the ease with which they could have avoided doing so.

Table 6A.1 Refusal Rates for Items on Self-Reported Delinquency Measure, by Age

Abbreviated title	Percent refused		
	Adult	Minor	Total
1. Runaway[a]	-	2.9	2.9
2. Truant[a]	-	2.9	2.9
3. Drinking[a]	-	3.2	3.2
4. Vandalism[b]	3.6	2.1	3.0
5. Fighting	3.1	1.6	2.5
6. Shoplifting	3.1	1.8	2.6
7. Petty theft	3.1	1.8	2.6
8. Grand theft	3.2	1.9	2.7
9. Robbery	3.0	1.8	2.6
10. Assault	3.1	2.0	2.7
11. Aggravated assault	3.1	1.8	2.6
12. Using marijuana	3.6	2.4	3.2
13. Using hard drugs	3.7	2.7	3.4
14. Selling marijuana	3.7	2.8	3.4
15. Selling hard drugs	3.6	2.5	3.2
16. Fraud	3.5	2.7	3.2
17. Auto theft	3.2	2.3	2.9
18. Breaking and entering	3.3	2.3	2.9
19. Fencing	3.3	2.3	2.9
20. Gambling	3.4	2.5	3.0

[a] Items 1-3 are status offenses, only illegal for minors. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-17 on interview date (N=11,200,000).

[b] Items 4-20 were asked of the total sample. UNIVERSE: Civilians age 15-23 on interview date (N=31,600,000).

Chapter 6 APPENDIX 2

Measuring Police and Criminal Justice Involvement

Measuring police contacts for a national sample is made very complex by the variations among local jurisdictions in terminologies and policies on when and how to intervene in situations. Additionally, even if the variations in police and court behavior could be controlled, the perceptions of youths about what has happened will be somewhat different from the official record. It was decided to try to assess incidents that would have a distinctive behavioral component across jurisdictions to facilitate consistent responses. Thus we asked about being booked or charged, since this involves formal processing, but not about being arrested, since there are various levels of ambiguity between being asked to come to the police station and being coerced into it. The three levels of police contact measured were: being stopped by police, being booked or charged, and being convicted. For charges and convictions, we asked whether they had ever been charged or convicted as adults. Because there have been suggestions that youth who come in contact with the law at an early age are particularly likely to continue on to adult crime, we asked the first time youths had had each sort of contact. We also asked the number of contacts, and the date of the most recent one. For convictions, we asked which charges had been involved.

In addition to asking about police involvement, we asked about official dispositions--probation, incarceration in youth facilities, and incarceration in adult facilities. The growing use of diversion programs, in which youths are not formally processed within the juvenile justice system but are referred to services, posed a real problem for assessment. We asked whether the youth had been referred to court-related counseling or to a diversion program by police, schools, courts, or parents. This probably does not capture the full range of possible dispositions, but the wording was selected to minimize the chance that non-delinquency related referrals would be reported.

Chapter 6 Glossary

Police Contact Terms

ASSAULT
An attack on a person with a weapon or hands; e.g., battery, rape, aggravated assault, manslaughter

BREAKING AND ENTERING
Trespass, other property offense (except burglary)

CHARGED
Booked or charged with something either by the police, or by someone connected with the courts (except minor traffic offenses)

CHARGED AS ADULT
Booked or charged in adult court (except minor traffic offenses)

CONVICTED
Convicted of anything (except minor traffic offenses)

CONVICTED AS ADULT
Convicted in adult court (except minor traffic offenses)

COUNSELING
Referred to a court-related counseling program by the police, courts, school or parents

DRINKING UNDER AGE
Drinking or possession of alcohol under age

EXPELLED
Expelled from school

INCARCERATED
Sentenced to spend time in a corrections institution, such as a jail or prison, or in a youth institution, such as a training school or reform school

INCARCERATED AS ADULT
Sent to an adult corrections institution

INCARCERATED AS YOUTH
Sent to a youth corrections institution

MAJOR TRAFFIC OFFENSE
Driving under the influence of alcohol or other drug, reckless driving, driving without a license, etc.

POSSESSION, MARIJUANA
Possession or use of marijuana

PROBATION
Been on probation

ROBBERY
Taking something from someone using force or a weapon, e.g., robbery, mugging, "hold up"

STOPPED
Stopped by the police, but not picked up or arrested (except for minor traffic offenses)

SUSPENDED
Suspended from school, even for a short period of time

THEFT
Taking something without the use of force; e.g., burglary, larceny, shoplifting (theft not coded elsewhere)

VANDALISM
Destruction of property, malicious destruction

Chapter 6 REFERENCES

Ageton, S.S. and Elliott, D.S. 1978. The incidence of delinquent behavior in a national probability sample of adolescents. (Project Report No. 3) The Dynamics of Delinquent Behavior: A National Survey MM 27552. Boulder, Colorado: Behavioral Research Institute.

Bachman, J.G., O'Malley, P.M., and Johnston, J. 1978. Youth in transition, Volume VI: Adolescence to adulthood-change and stability in the lives of young men. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan.

Berger, R.J., Crowley, J.E., Gold, M. and Gray, J. 1975. Experiment in a Juvenile Court: a study of a program of volunteers working with juvenile probationers. ISR-4055. Ann Arbor, Michigan: Institute for Research, University of Michigan.

Elliott, D.S. and Ageton, S.S. 1980. Reconciling differences in estimates of delinquency. American Sociological Review, 45: 95-110.

Gold, M. 1970. Delinquent behavior in an American city. Belmont, California: Brooks/Cole.

Hardt, R.H. and Peterson-Hardt, S. 1977. On determining the quality of the delinquency self-report method. Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 14: 247-261.

Hindelang, M.J., Hirschi, T. and Weiss, J.G. 1981. Measuring Delinquency. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Hirschi, T. 1969. Causes of Delinquency. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Schur, E.M. 1973. Radical Non-Intervention: Rethinking the Delinquency Problem. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall Inc.

Tittle, C.R., Villemez, W.J. and Smith, D. 1978. The myth of social class and criminality: an empirical assessment of the empirical evidence. American Sociological Review, 43: 643-656.

The Quality of Work Life Project, another ongoing study, began in 1975 as an attempt to improve both the productivity and the meaningfulness of work for public employees in the cities of Springfield and Columbus. Today Center staff also serve as third party advisors and researchers exploring new techniques for attainment of management-worker cooperation and worker health in a number of central Ohio private sector industries.

The Center has also been active in manpower planning both in the U.S. and in the developing countries. A project for the Ohio Advisory Council for Vocational Education identified the highly fragmented institutions and agencies responsible for supplying vocational and technical training in Ohio. Subsequent projects for the Ohio Occupational Information Coordinating Committee have followed graduates of these programs. These data and information on occupational distributions of employers collected for the Occupational Employment Statistics Program are being integrated into a comprehensive planning model which will be accessible to trainees and employers and linked to a national network.

Another focus of research is industrial relations and collective bargaining. In a project for the U.S. Department of Labor, staff members are evaluating several current experiments for expedited grievance procedures, working with unions and management in a variety of industries. The procedural adequacies, safeguards for due process, cost and timing of the new procedure are being weighed against traditional arbitration techniques.

Senior staff also serve as consultants to many boards and commissions at the national and state level. Recent papers have been written for the Joint Economic Committee of Congress, The National Commission for Employment and Unemployment Statistics, The National Commission for Employment Policy, The White House Conference on the Family, The Ohio Department of Corrections, The Ohio Board of Regents, The Ohio Governor's Task Force on Health, and the Ohio Governor's Task Force on Welfare.

The Center maintains a working library of approximately 10,000 titles, including a wide range of reference works and current periodicals, as well as an extensive microfilm and microfiche collection. Through their facilities linked to the university computer, the Center's data processing staff provide statistical, technical, and programming support both for in-house researchers and the over 250 users of the National Longitudinal Surveys data tapes. They maintain the NLS tapes, data base, documentation and associated software.

For more information on specific Center activities or for a copy of the Publications List, write: Director, Center for Human Resource Research, 5701 North High Street, Worthington, Ohio 43085.

The Center for Human Resource Research

The Center for Human Resource Research is a policy-oriented multidisciplinary research organization affiliated with the Faculty of Labor and Human Resources in the College of Administrative Science of The Ohio State University. Established in 1965, the Center is concerned with a wide range of contemporary problems associated with human resource development, conservation and use. Its more than thirty senior staff members have been drawn from the disciplines of economics, education, English, health sciences, industrial relations, management science, psychology, public administration, social work and sociology. This multidisciplinary team is supported by approximately seventy graduate research associates, full-time research assistants, computer programmers and other personnel.

The Center has acquired pre-eminence in the fields of labor market research and manpower planning. The National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience have been the responsibility of the Center since 1965, with continuing support from the United States Department of Labor. Staff have been called upon for population and human resource planning assistance throughout the world with major studies conducted in Bolivia, Ecuador, and Venezuela. At the request of the National Science Foundation, a review of the state of the art in human resource planning was conducted. In other studies the impact of labor and education policy on labor supply has been assessed and employment statistics collection methods have been evaluated. Senior personnel are also engaged in several other areas of research including collective bargaining and labor relations, evaluation and monitoring of the operation of government employment and training programs, and the projection of health education and facility needs.

The Center for Human Resource Research has received over two million dollars annually from government agencies and private foundations to support its research in recent years. Providing support have been the U.S. Departments of Labor, State, Defense, and Health, Education, and Welfare; Ohio's Health and Education Departments and Bureau of Employment Services; the Ohio cities of Columbus and Springfield; the Ohio AFL-CIO; the George Gund Foundation; the Rockefeller Foundation; and the Ford Foundation. The breadth of research interests may be seen by examining a few of the present projects.

The largest Center project is the National Longitudinal Surveys of Labor Market Experience. This project has involved repeated interviews over a fifteen-year period with four groups of the United States population: older men, middle-aged women, and young men and women. The data are collected for 20,000 individuals by the U.S. Bureau of the Census, and the Center is responsible for data analysis. To date dozens of research monographs and special reports on the NLS have been prepared by the staff. Responsibilities also include the preparation and distribution of data tapes for public use. Since 1979, an additional cohort of 13,000 young men and women between the ages of 14 and 21 has been followed. This cohort includes for the first time those serving in the armed forces at the time of the initial interview. Plans call for interviewing this youth cohort for at least five years. The Center also provides analysis and public use tapes for this cohort; field work is handled by The National Opinion Research Center (continued on inside back cover).